

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Sunnyside Store Co., of Sunnyside, Mont., asking that the duty on raw and refined sugar be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Third National Peace Congress, favoring an arbitration treaty with other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Resolution of the North Side Board of Trade of the City of New York, urging the ratification of treaty providing for reciprocal trade relations with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the Bronx in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Resolution adopted by the National Association of Automobile Manufacturers, urging the amendment of the corporation-tax law to allow corporations to make their returns as of the end of their fiscal years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: Resolutions adopted by the National Association of Automobile Manufacturers, praying that Congress so amend the corporation-tax law as to permit corporations and companies to make reports under its provisions at the end of their individual fiscal years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., in favor of reduction in tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Papers accompanying claims of Joseph Donnelly and August Grunewald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Papers to accompany a bill for the reimbursement of Ralph E. Hess for two horses lost while hired by the United States Geological Survey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, copy of the report of the special committee appointed by the Coalinga Chamber of Commerce to investigate the leasing bill for Government oil lands as prepared by Senator GRONNA; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the board of trustees of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging upon Congress the imperative need for an amendment to the corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the W. L. Pearce Co. and 41 citizens of Los Gatos, Cal., urging a material reduction in the present duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Papers to accompany bill to authorize and require the Solicitor of the Treasury to convey by quitclaim deed all the right, title, and interest that the United States has in certain lands in Clay County, Ala., to Osceola Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of numerous citizens of Bellingham, Wash., protesting against Senate bill 237; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of Oakley & Co., of New York City, in opposition to Sherley bill (H. R. 8887); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Milwaukee Clearing House Association, favoring legislation affecting the cold-storage industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Manufacturers' Association of New York, favoring revision of the tariff, schedule by schedule, and opportunity for all affected to be heard before enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, indorsing the Berger resolution for an investigation of the McNamara affair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Group 6, New York State Bankers' Association, in favor of the general scope of the Aldrich proposal for currency reform and the creation of a proper discount market in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of New York Pharmaceutical Association, in opposition to the Sherley bill (H. R. 8887); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. Planten & Son, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in opposition to Sherley bill (H. R. 8887); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. Jaekel & Co., favoring the amendment of the Federal corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Plattsmouth, Nebr., requesting a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Memorial of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce relative to coal lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., urging the fortification of that harbor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of board of supervisors of Calaveras County, Cal., urging that the United States should acquire control of the Calaveras, or Mammoth, Big Tree Grove situated in that county; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolutions of the Chambers of Commerce of Fresno County and San Francisco, Cal., urging that the corporation-tax law be amended so as to permit corporations to make their returns as of the close of their fiscal years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of 981 citizens of Derby, Conn., asking that Congress appropriate \$100,000 for the purchase of a post-office site and the erection thereon of a building; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of numerous citizens of New Jersey, protesting against the proposed arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of numerous citizens of Texas, asking that the duty on sugar be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of the Federated Improvement Association of Los Angeles, Cal., for relief from the restriction of American water shipping and resolution indorsing House bill 4660; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Elizabeth, N. J., urging the passage of the reciprocity trade agreement between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by Sagger Makers Local No. 63, N. B. of O. P., of Trenton, N. J., urging immediate action by the House of Representatives on the resolution of investigation of the lawfulness of the arrest of John J. McNamara, introduced by Representative BERGER, of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association, against the enactment of House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 27, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. President, I desire to give notice at this time that on Thursday morning, immediately after the routine morning business, if convenient to the Senate, I will submit some observations on House bill 4412, known as the Canadian reciprocity bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Iowa, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KERN presented resolutions adopted by the Carmel Quarterly Meeting of Friends' Church, held at Noblesville, Ind., favoring the adoption of international arbitration and universal peace, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WATSON presented memorials of Flora Grange, No. 164, of French Creek; Mount Zion Grange, No. 39, of Lightburn; Unity Grange, No. 358, of Charleston; Union Grange, No. 90, of Cottageville; and Phoenix Grange, of Union, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHIVELY presented resolutions adopted by the Carmel Quarterly Meeting of Friends' Church, held at Noblesville, Ind., favoring the adoption of international arbitration and universal peace, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BAILEY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Valley View, Tex., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday-rest bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I desire to present the following order for the consideration of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to submit the following order.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on Monday, July 24, 1911, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on that day, without further debate, a vote shall be taken in the Senate upon all amendments then pending or to be offered, and that the amendments agreed to shall be considered engrossed, the bill read the third time, and the vote shall then be upon the final passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. HEYBURN, and Mr. BRISTOW addressed the Chair.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to have the whole order read first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the rest of the order.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed, by unanimous consent, that on Wednesday, July 26, 1911, following the routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on that day, without further debate, a vote shall be taken in the Senate upon all amendments then pending or to be offered, and that the amendments agreed to shall be considered engrossed, the bill read a third time, and the vote shall then be upon the final passage of the bill.

It is agreed, by unanimous consent, that on Thursday, July 27, 1911, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on that day, without further debate, a vote shall be taken in the Senate upon all amendments then pending or to be offered, and that the amendments agreed to shall be considered engrossed, the bill read the third time, and the vote shall then be upon the final passage of the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think that debate had better proceed on the so-called reciprocity bill. It is possible that by July 24 Senators will have been fully heard, and that a vote may be taken at that time upon the bill. Possibly a vote may be reached sooner than July 24; I do not know about that. I am unwilling, so far as I am concerned, that a time shall be fixed for a vote until that bill has been fully debated, until it shall have been shown to the country just what its true character is, and until all the amendments which are offered or to be offered shall have been fully discussed.

For that reason, Mr. President, I must interpose an objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's objection goes to all three orders? They are presented as separate orders. The Chair simply wishes to know; that is all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I directed my remarks especially to the reciprocity bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the Senator's observation was directed to one special bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object to fixing a time on which a vote shall be taken on that bill; at least, I object to the fixing of the time now, until debate shall have proceeded further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin objects to the entry of the first order. Is there objection—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to hear some—

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, an explanation. I rose—and the RECORD will, perhaps, show that I did—after the reading of the first order. I do not want to have it inferred from what the RECORD may show that I rose to object. I rose to ask for the reading of the other two orders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the entry of the second or third order?

Mr. NELSON, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. BRISTOW addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota first rose. The Chair will then recognize the Senator from Texas.

Mr. NELSON. I feel like objecting, but I will suggest to the chairman of the committee that we take the vote first on the farmers' free-list bill, then on the wool bill, and then, about two weeks after that time, that we take the vote on the reciprocity bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, before any agreement can be made about this matter I think the Senate is entitled to know as much about it as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows; and if it is parliamentary for me to do so, I should like for him to advise the Senate whether or not, in his opinion, the President intends to veto the free-list bill and the woolen bill. As the spokesman of the administration, or one of them, he ought to be able to inform the Senate on that subject.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I would have no right to state if I knew, but as a matter of fact I have no knowledge as to what the action of the President would be upon these measures. Last week the Senate took the unprecedented course of instructing the Finance Committee to report the wool bill within 20 days. Being deeply impressed with the vigor of the majority and desiring to get in harmony with the wishes of the majority, I am endeavoring to cooperate to have speedy action on all these measures. The committee concluded that it was impossible to grant this indecent treatment to the hundreds of persons who had filed formal applications for a hearing before the committee, and therefore resolved that it would be idle to attempt hearings, and the bills were reported out the following morning for the consideration of the Senate.

Now, I want to expedite the public business. I believe that the country is looking to the Senate for performance of some kind. If it is the will of the majority of the Senate that the so-called free-list bill and the wool bill should be enacted into law, I will again abide by the decision of the majority. If the President in his wisdom shall see fit to sign them, I will endeavor to pursue the even tenor of my way under them as laws. But I do not see any use during midsummer in an indefinite delay.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the readiness with which the Senator from Pennsylvania acquiesces in the decision of the Senate excites my suspicion. I am very free to say that I have learned to regard him as a pretty stubborn sort of a fighter, and I am compelled to think that the Senator from Pennsylvania now calculates that if these bills are passed separately, because evidently it is the program to vote on one and then on the other and then on the third, the President will approve the reciprocity bill, about which he seems to be so deeply concerned, and will veto the other two bills which have come to us from the House.

In his message to the House only a few days ago the President declared that there ought not to be any tariff legislation until the Tariff Board reports, and the newspapers indicate that the President has communicated to his friends in the Senate a statement that he will veto the reciprocity bill if any amendment is attached to it.

It is inconceivable to me that the President of the United States would veto a bill which he desires simply because there was attached to it another bill unless he intended to veto that other bill if presented to him as a separate proposition. It looks to me like we are invited to a feast and we are to be made to entertain ourselves at the second table.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that there is nothing in the suggested order which will prevent any number of tariff amendments being inserted on the reciprocity bill, should the majority of the Senate so determine. As to the President's approval or disapproval of the bill, I can not see that it makes any difference to the Senator from Texas or any other Senator whether that fatal act occurs in midsummer or later in the fall.

Mr. BAILEY. But if it is bad, the longer it is postponed the better, I suppose; but the time does not interest me. It is the fact I want.

Here, Mr. President, is my situation—and we might as well be frank with each other about it: I know that we have no chance to pass either the free-list bill or the woolen bill except with the aid of certain Republicans. It happens that nearly all

of the Republicans who are ready to assist us in passing those bills are all opposed to this reciprocity bill.

For one time in my life I find myself in accord from top to bottom with the Republican insurgents on this reciprocity bill and upon practically every aspect of it. The truth of it is, I am rather inclined to think that they would feel at liberty to invite me to their caucus if they held one on that, and I am inclined to think I would feel more at home with them on that question than with anybody else in the Senate; and I intend to act in good faith with them because I know we have no hope of passing either the free-list bill or the woolen bill without their assistance.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. In one moment. So far as I am personally concerned—and on this question I speak and act only for myself, of course—I do not intend to assent to any arrangement that will enable the Democrats who are in favor of reciprocity to join with the stalwarts and get this reciprocity bill through the Senate, which the President will approve, and then leave us to rely on the Republican insurgents to help us pass the other bills to encounter a presidential veto. We have the power now to send all three of those bills to the President and compel him to take all of them or none of them, sir, and it will be a strange attitude for the Democratic Party if it allows itself to be so placed that it is more anxious to pass a Republican President's reciprocity bill than it is the Democratic House free-list and wool bill. Now I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas by what authority he makes the statement that the insurgents who will support the free-list bill and the woolen-schedule bill are all opposed to the reciprocity bill?

Mr. BAILEY. I hardly stated it in that form. If I did, I did not accurately state what was in my mind. I said our only hope of passing these bills is through the votes of certain Republicans who are opposed to the reciprocity bill. I do not understand that all the insurgents, actual and near insurgents, are opposed to the reciprocity bill, but my understanding is that substantially all of them are.

Mr. WORKS. I just wanted to say that I suppose I am classed as an insurgent, and—

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator's name stands pretty high on that list, I think.

Mr. WORKS. I merely wish to say that the Senator from Texas has no authority to make that statement so far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, while I am in agreement, I am glad to say, with the insurgents now, I am not assuming any authority to speak for any of them. They have a habit of speaking for themselves, and speaking plainly and speaking well. I am in such an attitude about the reciprocity bill that I am not even permitted to speak for a fraction of the Democrats. I am rather inclined to think that I am almost alone over here, but I want to say there will be many Democrats who will regret they did not join me if it transpires that the President gets the corn and the Democratic Party gets the husk, which it will get even if it does not get the free-list bill and the woolen schedule enacted into law.

Mr. President, I want to go one step further and say, if we were to send the Canadian reciprocity bill amended by the free-list bill and a woolen bill—because, frankly, sir, I do not expect we shall pass the woolen bill as it came from the other House, though I would like to see that done—I perfectly understand that those Republicans, sometimes called insurgents and sometimes called progressives, do not agree with us; they do not favor as low a revision as we do, and yet they desire very much lower than the existing duties, and they probably will not vote for the bill as it comes from the other House even with the amendments which, on my own behalf and on my own responsibility, I shall offer. I expect to be compelled, finally, to vote for their bill, and I shall do that cheerfully if they offer a better bill than the existing law, and it could hardly be possible that they would offer a worse one; but, sir, if the President of the United States, presented with these three measures combined in one, should veto the entire bill, he would be at such a disadvantage in the presidential contest as would almost relieve that struggle from its anxiety and its doubt.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. One moment. The President himself has declared that the woolen schedule is not defensible. He has declared repeatedly that Canadian reciprocity is a triumph of diplomacy and of statesmanship. He has deemed it of such magnitude and of such importance that he has not only traversed the country campaigning in its behalf, but he convened the Congress of the United States in extraordinary session to pass it; and yet with a woolen bill that meets his criticism

against the existing woolen schedule, with a reciprocity bill that he proclaims as his very own, there would be nothing left but the small, insignificant free list to justify the interposition of a veto. I do not believe he would veto all of them; and yet as certain as we send in this reciprocity bill alone and afterwards send him the other bills, just so certain, in my opinion, the other two will incur the presidential veto.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas says that the President would be in a bad situation politically if he should veto the reciprocity bill amended by the wool-schedule bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I ought to have said I thought he would be in a worse situation. I think he is in a bad situation now.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will not dispute that proposition with the Senator—but what I wanted to ask the Senator was this—since the Senator is considering the political effect of the President's veto—if, after having made a campaign for the Presidency upon the platform of tariff revision, this reciprocity bill should pass Congress and then we should pass reasonable reductions of other schedules of the tariff, and they should be submitted to the President, if he is to be actuated by the political effect, would he veto, could he afford to veto, a revision of the wool schedule and a reasonable reduction of other schedules of the tariff separate and apart from the reciprocity bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I hope unanimous consent will be given to vote on these two bills according to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. DIXON. On which two bills?

Mr. HEYBURN. On the free list and the wool bills.

Mr. BAILEY. I can satisfy the Senator from Montana, I believe, if he will go into executive session with me, that this is the wisest thing for us to do. I will assume that responsibility, if the Senator will not object.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I will have to have some further light upon this subject at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. I will try to give it to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I will clear this situation, then, as I do not know what information the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the entry of the second order.

Mr. BAILEY. That will give me time to hold a session with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIXON. I think I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has objected. That ends that proposition. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I wanted to state why I could not consent to the proposed order, at this time at least. It is perfectly evident, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has just said, that the program which has apparently been adopted by the Democratic Senators certainly will result, if carried to a final conclusion, in the passage of the reciprocity bill and the veto of any bills looking to general tariff revision. That is the inevitable result of the present situation, and the Senators on the other side of the Chamber might as well accept it.

I personally have no reason to attempt to hold the Senate in protracted session, but the chairman of the Finance Committee, with his wide experience in legislation and his wisdom, certainly must know that no popgun bill for the revision of the tariff can become a law; and that the debate and the amendments of the wool schedule, whether any more schedules come over from the other House or not, will have to embrace every phase of tariff legislation before this session adjourns. There is no secret about that matter. The Republican Senators, especially those from the Northwest, I think have made it plain that if this new propaganda of free trade in agricultural products, under the guise of Canadian reciprocity, avowedly for the benefit of the great manufacturing centers of the East and for the millers and the border railroads, is to become the policy of the Republican Party, then we have got to reedit our old textbooks on political economy.

The Senator from Texas was a little bit loose in his language this morning in referring to Republican Senators on this side of the Chamber who are opposed to reciprocity as insurgents. A majority of Republican Senators here—

Mr. BAILEY. Allow me to correct the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. BAILEY. I may have been loose in my language, because I came into the Senate while this matter was in progress, and I was trying to reason out in my mind the situation while I was talking, and, when I finally reasoned it out, the Senator from Montana was not amenable to my suggestion; but I want to say that I do not mean that all the Republicans who are opposed to reciprocity are insurgents, nor do I mean that all the Republicans who are insurgents are opposed to reciprocity, but still my statement stands that the Democrats have no earthly hope of passing any of these tariff-revision bills except with the aid of Republicans who are opposed to reciprocity.

Mr. DIXON. But what I mean, Mr. President, in adverting to the looseness of expression of the Senator from Texas in referring to the Republican Senators who are opposed to reciprocity as being insurgents is this: The term "insurgent," as I understand its meaning, applies to a minority of a certain political party. I think there are about 30 Republican Senators on this side of the Chamber opposed to reciprocity; certainly more than a majority of the Republican Senators in this Chamber are opposed to it, unless it carries with it as a coordinate scheme the general lowering of tariff duties in this country. The Republican Senators who are supporting reciprocity, with the aid of practically the solid Democratic vote, are now the insurgents of the Republican Party. It is the minority section of Republican Senators, led by intrepid and gallant warriors from certain States in New England and from New York and Pennsylvania, who have absorbed the term that was formerly applied to a minority of Republican Senators in this body.

If the Democratic membership of the Senate really want tariff revision and are not simply posing and attempting to play politics for the next presidential campaign, I want to say to them that so soon as Republican Senators are convinced that reciprocity is going to become a law there are plenty of votes, and to spare, on this side of the Chamber added to the Democratic vote to pass as an amendment to the reciprocity bill, as a correlated subject, a general tariff-revision scheme, and there will be no doubt about the brand it will carry when it comes to a final vote in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Montana—and I speak for myself alone, but I believe that my views will be concurred in by every Senator on this side—that if the Senator from Montana, or any other Senator on the other side who is cooperating with him, will say to this side, speaking ex cathedra, that the President of the United States will approve the reciprocity measure if amended and as amended, I believe that every Senator on this side is willing to go farther than those who go farthest on the other side in favor of attaching a general tariff revision to the reciprocity bill.

Mr. DIXON. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I can not guarantee what the President of the United States may or may not do, but the policy that is now being pursued by a majority of the Democratic Senators inevitably leads to free trade in farm products and the maintenance of high protective tariff duties on manufactured articles. There is no escaping that conclusion, as the Senator from Texas has well demonstrated this morning. You are accentuating by your own act the differences heretofore complained of in protective tariff duties. It may be good politics, but it does not lead to the result that the Senator from Oklahoma has contended for ever since he has been in the Senate.

If we are to have reciprocity, if we are to have free trade in all farm products, there is an abundance of votes on this side of the Chamber to unite with you in a general tariff revision as an amendment to the reciprocity bill, so that reciprocity and general tariff revision may carry through as one comprehensive scheme.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DIXON. Gladly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the Senator from Montana, simply as one honest man speaking to another, this question—

Mr. DIXON. I will meet the Senator half way on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Whether he does not know that the result of that maneuver would be to kill both propositions, and whether that is not his intent?

Mr. DIXON. I answer the Senator from Mississippi frankly, that is not my intent; but I do not believe—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it not, in the Senator's opinion, be the plain, palpable, and obvious result?

Mr. DIXON. I do not believe it would.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator believes that the President of the United States, then, in spite of his public utterances—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the Senator from Montana has yielded to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Montana believes, then, that the President of the United States, in spite of his public utterances, would sign a bill which was a general revision of the tariff?

Mr. DIXON. I do not see how he could refuse to sign it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator does not see how a protectionist President could refuse to sign a bill that Democrats and tariff revisionists, meaning by that revisionists downward, would send to him, a bill expressing their views, and the Senator is willing to say to the Senate and to the country that he believes a protectionist President would sign such a bill?

Mr. DIXON. I am not authorized to speak for the President in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not saying that. I am asking you about your own belief, not about any question of authority.

Mr. DIXON. I believe he would sign it; yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator believes he would sign it?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I thought that, I would be happy.

Mr. BAILEY. If we vote for his bill, he might sign our bills.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. DIXON. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to ask the Senator from Mississippi, with the permission of the Senator from Montana, by what authority he intimates that the President will not sign the other bills referred to while he will sign the reciprocity bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the authority of common sense, by the authority of ordinary observation, by the authority of historical information, by the authority that leads me to believe that if I get on a street car out there going in a certain direction and keep on it I will land at the terminus.

Mr. NELSON. What is the object, then, in attempting to pass these other bills when you expect that they will inevitably receive the presidential veto? Is it for politics you are moving?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are not expecting to attempt to pass a general tariff bill. It would be madness. The Democratic House has not undertaken that. Upon the contrary, they have undertaken to revise the tariff downward as well as they may by special schedules, hoping that some of those schedules would meet the support of the Senate of the United States, although nominally Republican, and might meet with the approval of the President of the United States. For example, I believe that a reasonable revision of the woolen schedule, as an original measure, ought to pass this House after reciprocity is out of the way; and I believe that, if Senators on the other side are consistent with their past records, enough of them will vote for it to pass it; and I believe that, in view of his past utterances concerning Schedule K, the President himself, who said that that schedule was indefensible, would be forced either to stultify himself grossly or to sign it. I believe there are several schedules which we might be able to put through in that way.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not believe, and I started to say I did not believe that anybody believed, but I will not say that, because I have had the assurance from one Senator that he does believe, that the President of the United States would sign a general tariff bill. Nor do I believe that enough votes for a general tariff bill could be obtained upon the other side of the Chamber to send it to the President except as an amendment to the Canadian reciprocity bill with the purpose and with the intent of killing the bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana surrender the floor?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, after this very interesting episode I should like, if possible, to propose an agreement to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Finance Committee. I take it for granted that he did not expect these orders, or either of them, would receive the assent of the Senate.

I noticed in this morning's paper—I observe in passing that I am sorry to see that my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, is falling into the habit of being interviewed—that these orders were to be proposed this morning in order to fasten the responsibility for a continuance of this session upon certain Senators.

I for one am perfectly willing to bear my share of the responsibility of continuing this session until we have debated every material and pertinent phase that arises out of the propositions now before the Senate. I assume that we all understand that no time can be fixed for voting upon the proposed reciprocal measure until there has been such a discussion of it as will enable us to predict with reasonable certainty what further time may be required for its consideration.

Now, I want to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will not agree to present these orders once each day, at a specified time, so that we may be prepared for them, and not anticipate that they may come in at any hour of the session. Will he not agree that in every morning hour they shall be presented, in order to fasten the responsibility upon certain recalcitrant Senators?

Mr. PENROSE. I had not intended to offer these orders every day, but if the Senator from Iowa desires me to do so, I shall be glad to offer them as nearly as I can every day before the close of the morning business.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood from the interview that I read that they were to be presented day after day. I do not know that that was a correct or veracious interview.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not give any interview, Mr. President. It is impossible to prevent the quoting in an incorrect way of casual conversations in these transactions. I talked to a number of Senators yesterday afternoon on this subject, the Senator from Iowa being among them, and I supposed what 10 or 15 Senators know about is difficult of suppression or concealment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, absolutely no suggestion of suppression or concealment. Otherwise the Senator from Pennsylvania would not have advertised it in the newspapers.

Mr. PENROSE. My talk was not of a confidential nature, and I did not care whether it was published in the newspapers or not. My intention has been to do all I can to expedite voting on these measures. I have endeavored to treat them with absolute impartiality. These orders take the bills in the order of their reception by the Senate. I have requested the Senate to give unanimous consent to their adoption regardless of the fact whether I personally favor these measures or am opposed to them. I have endeavored to carry out the will of the Senate as expressed last week when it declared by a decisive majority that the Finance Committee should have 20 days to consider these two tariff bills, and I have asked 30 days to consider them, to wind them up, to dispose of them, to allow the business interests of the country to be at rest and know where they are, and let us adjourn.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask another question of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The great matter of doubt in the Senate seems to be with respect to the attitude of the President of the United States toward bills that may be passed revising a few of the prominent and especially burdensome schedules of the tariff. If it were known positively what the President would do respecting those matters I think there would be an instant clarification of the atmosphere in the Senate, and we could proceed with a great deal more certainty than we seem now to be able to proceed with.

Now, will the Senator from Pennsylvania persuade the Senator from Utah to withdraw his objection to the unanimous agreement which fixes the day for voting on the free-list schedule and the wool schedule, because if we could consider and pass the revisions of these schedules and one or two others of equal prominence and importance and send them to the President and ascertain in that way—and I suppose that is the only way in which it can be ascertained with absolute certainty—just what he will do with respect to them, then the problem concerning the reciprocal measure will be very much simplified?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. It does not seem to me that it would be proper to pass the free-list bill before we pass the reciprocity bill.

The free-list bill is supposed to be a balm for the injuries which we will do to the farmers, and we ought not to administer the balm until we have been sure that we have injured them.

Mr. CUMMINS. It seems to me reasonably sure that the injury is to be done. Everybody concedes that the free-list agricultural bill is to pass, and I do not see any particular objection to having the balm at least in readiness to be applied the moment the wound is inflicted.

Mr. BACON. I simply want to suggest, with the permission of the Senator, that while I do not agree as to the purpose of the passage of the free-list bill, there is such a thing as an antidote as well as compensation; some antidote is given in advance.

Mr. CUMMINS. I thank the Senator from Georgia for the very wise suggestion, and I renew my inquiry of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I fear that the Senator from Iowa is not willing to treat this legislation as impartially as I am. I have asked the Senate to agree to a date for voting on all three bills. Is he prepared to join in such an agreement regardless of the order?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not, for the very obvious reason that there is no uncertainty with regard to the President's attitude toward the reciprocal measure. No one doubts his willingness and desire to give that measure, if it shall pass, his approval. The doubt arises with regard to the other measure, and there is but one way in which to remove that doubt, namely, give the Chief Executive the opportunity which the law and Constitution give him to indicate his approval or disapproval of these measures.

Mr. PENROSE. I can not see, in all fairness, what difference it makes on this situation as to what the President is going to do; neither can I see, in my own mind, at least, what difference the action of the Senate is going to make.

I do not know, I have no information, no belief, as to whether there is a majority in the Senate to pass the free-list bill and the wool bill or not, or whether there is a majority to pass these two bills in an amended and modified form. But I am ready, as I have tried to be all my life, to bow to the inevitable, and if the Senate passes these bills I shall bow to the verdict of the only ultimate tribunal in the United States, and that is the will of a majority. If the President sees fit to approve or sign them, I shall feel as most of my colleagues will feel, that we have at least discharged our duty and not wasted our time in idle delay from day to day without accomplishing any result.

This reciprocity bill has been before the Senate now on its third week, and with the exception of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] I do not just now recall any Senator who has made the promised speeches on the measure which it was generally understood were in course of preparation. We have had running debate and idle talk without accomplishing anything, as far as I know or can see.

Now, if we could show the country that we are going to meet the issues, regardless of our personal preference or wish, it can only have a good effect, and nothing but a good effect. The country is entitled to it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. May I reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania before I yield to the Senator from Texas? I am exceedingly sorry to hear the Senator from Pennsylvania so characterize the very interesting and instructive address made by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR] as well as the several addresses that were delivered yesterday, and some before, upon the amendment reported by the committee. I am sure that upon reflection the Senator will withdraw what must have been an unreflective statement, that nothing but idle talk has occurred with respect to this matter during the last week.

Mr. PENROSE. In my statement I referred more to the discussion of the general bill. Of course, the committee amendment which was defeated yesterday was not in my mind when I made the statement.

But it is well understood that some dozen Senators have signified to their associates their intention to speak at considerable length on this measure. The Senator from Iowa is one of them. And the third week of the consideration of this bill has elapsed, and not until to-morrow will the Senate have the privilege of being enlightened by his remarks.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have availed myself of every convenient opportunity in the past, just as I intend to do in the future. I trust the Senator from Pennsylvania will not comfort himself by the thought that the Senator from Iowa will make but one speech upon this matter. It is quite likely that as we draw along the length of these amendments there will be more

than one occasion upon which I shall feel it necessary for me to impose myself upon the patience of the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. It is with a full conviction that there will be more than one speech that I would like to see the first one unloaded.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no doubt the Senator from Pennsylvania is awaiting with exceeding impatience the deliverance of the Senator from Iowa. I can only say that while speeches have not been very frequent, I have yet to hear anything from the Senator from Pennsylvania in behalf of the proposed measure.

But I want to assure him that he is entirely mistaken with regard to my motive. If the farmers of this country could be given the right to buy what they must buy in a free market, or a comparatively free market, I for one will vote for the reciprocity measure. It will be my only concern during the course of the entire discussion that when we take the farmer and introduce him into free competition with his only competitor, practically, we shall give him at the same time the right to buy some of the things he must buy in a market freer than we now have. It is therefore that I want to know, and I believe a great many Senators share my desire in that respect, whether we are to have at this session some amelioration of the burdens which the farmer must bear—not only bear whether this free agricultural bill is passed or not, but especially bear if it is passed. I think it is only fair, it is only honest with the American people, to determine in advance whether the relief that I have suggested is to be given to them.

I inquired, therefore, in absolute good faith of the Senator from Pennsylvania whether he would be willing to renew his request that a time be fixed for voting upon the wool bill and the free-list bill and such other bills as may be attached to it which seek to remove the burdensome duties with which we are now afflicted before we reach a conclusion upon the reciprocity measure.

Mr. BACON. I want, if the Senator will pardon me, to say a word on the matter of those orders. I was called out of the Chamber. I understand they have been disposed of. Am I correct, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have been.

Mr. BACON. I simply want to call attention to a matter that may be of importance in view of the fact that the request will probably be repeated.

Mr. STONE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STONE. I came in rather late. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania presented a request that a vote be taken on the pending bill, the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such a request was put, and objection was made thereto.

Mr. STONE. I understood—I am asking the Chair about it—that the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania was that the three bills should be voted on—one the 24th, another on the 25th, and the third on the 26th of July.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was made in three different requests for entry of three different orders.

Mr. STONE. Did the Senator from Utah object to the entire request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] objected to the request for a vote upon the reciprocity bill. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] objected to the entry of the other two orders.

Mr. STONE. I did not understand.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, as these requests are doubtless to be again proposed to the Senate, there is a matter of form to which I think it is important to call attention. I did not call attention to it while on the floor before, because I did not wish that anything I should say might be construed into any objection to voting upon the days designated, but I think the form of request is one which, if adopted, contravenes two rules of the Senate; and it is with a view of having the request, if hereafter presented, conform to those rules that I now call attention to them.

The request was that on a certain day and a certain hour the bills should be considered as engrossed and read the third time. Am I correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BACON. I say that that can not be done by unanimous consent, because the rules of the Senate, which can only be modified or changed in the way indicated by the rules, expressly provide that, in the first place, bills shall be considered in Committee of the Whole, and that indicates, of course, that they shall pass from Committee of the Whole. But what

is more directly to the point is Rule XV. I will read that rule:

RULE XV. 1. All bills and joint resolutions which shall have received two readings shall first be considered by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, after which they shall be reported to the Senate.

That is one rule. Mr. President, I say that that can not be obviated or dispensed with by unanimous consent. A rule can only be changed by the method prescribed in the rules themselves, which it is not necessary I should recite. What is perhaps more important is Rule XIV:

RULE XIV. 2. Every bill and joint resolution shall receive three readings previous to its passage, which readings shall be on three different days, unless the Senate unanimously direct otherwise.

The Senate can, by unanimous consent, dispense with the provision which requires the reading to be on three separate days, but the Senate can not by unanimous consent dispense with the three readings. We do dispense every day with the three several readings by having the two readings announced as having been made upon the first day.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is important, if the Senator from Pennsylvania desires to repeat the request or again present it to the Senate, that that point shall be guarded against. I think the only thing which is practicable is that the Senate shall do as we did, the Chair will remember, upon the former occasion—provide that we will take the matter up for disposition at the stage in which it is found at that time. It is perfectly competent for the Senate, before it reaches that day, to take it up and pass it from the Committee of the Whole into the Senate, and to pass the stage of the engrossment and third reading, and then bring it within the operation of the proposed consent. But I respectfully submit that with that positive provision in the rule we can not, in advance, say that a bill shall be considered as read the third time. Of course, I know that in the House of Representatives, where the rules are different, that is a constant practice, and a proper practice; and I am not prepared to say but that it might be a desirable practice here; but it is certainly, in my opinion, absolutely in conflict with the rules of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not believe it is the will of the Senate to ask for conferees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the motion.

Mr. HEYBURN. The motion is debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. HEYBURN. Let the House action be read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will, without objection, again read the resolution of the House.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 21, 1911.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the motion go over for the day. The Senate does not necessarily have to ask for conferees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not necessarily; but the motion has been made, and it is in order. It does not have to go over. It is one of the motions which, under the rule, should be proceeded with until disposed of.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the joint resolution does not go over by a mere objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. HEYBURN. It seems to me that the proper action is that the Senate do not concur in the action of the House. This is not upon an amendment; it is upon a joint resolution. The amendment has been absorbed in the joint resolution. I had not expected that a motion to appoint conferees would be made at this time. Of course the question next would come up on the adoption of the conference report. But it is a question whether the Senate should ask for a conference, the House not having asked for one.

The joint resolution came from the House. The Senate amended it and it went back to the House, and they declined to

agree to the amendment and did not ask for conferees. It is not the usual manner of proceeding. The question will arise now as to the vote required to send it to conference, because it is an entirety and it will affect the enactment of the joint resolution.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will remember that the amendment in the Senate was passed by a majority vote.

Mr. HEYBURN. But after it is passed the amendment can never again be considered by a majority vote, because the amendment became a part of the joint resolution. It is no longer an amendment.

Mr. BACON. What went to the House is an amendment solely.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is not an amendment now.

Mr. BACON. Yes; it is, so far as they are concerned. That is what they resolved they will not accept.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HEYBURN. I will yield the floor. I merely wanted that we should not just glide along and then afterwards discover that we had been on slippery ground.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Let the question be put.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. BACON the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALFRED D. BULLOCK AND OTHERS.

Mr. CRAWFORD, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred certain bills, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which were considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That in compliance with a communication from the chief justice of the Court of Claims, the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to return to the Court of Claims the congressional cases of Alfred D. Bullock and others, No. 13106—272, certified to the President of the Senate under date of February 20, 1908 (S. Doc. No. 314, 60th Cong., 1st sess.); Dorette H. Busching and others, No. 15003—17, certified to the President of the Senate under date of January 21, 1911 (S. Doc. No. 773, 61st Cong., 3d sess.); Jacob M. Davis and others, No. 13833—461, certified to the President of the Senate under date of June 13, 1909 (S. Doc. No. 107, 61st Cong., 1st sess.); Ada E. Much, widow, and others, No. 13727—98, certified to the President of the Senate under date of January 31, 1911 (S. Doc. No. 801, 61st Cong., 3d sess.); Mary E. Alcorn, widow, and others, No. 14188—75, certified to the President of the Senate under date of April 25, 1910 (S. Doc. No. 512, 61st Cong., 2d sess.); Nathan F. Amee and others, No. 13833—1, certified to the President of the Senate under date of December 6, 1909 (S. Doc. No. 190, 61st Cong., 2d sess.); George W. Bailey and others, No. 14124—140, certified to the President of the Senate under date of December 15, 1910 (S. Doc. No. 718, 61st Cong., 3d sess.); John E. Buckingham and others, No. 13786—51, certified to the President of the Senate under date of January 31, 1911 (S. Doc. No. 802, 61st Cong., 3d sess.); John W. Knight and others, No. 13786—1, certified to the President of the Senate under date of February 9, 1910 (S. Doc. No. 360, 61st Cong., 2d sess.); William A. Ashe and others, No. 14860—141, certified to the President of the Senate under date of January 30, 1911 (S. Doc. No. 796, 61st Cong., 3d sess.); Mary A. F. Barry, widow, and others, No. 14124—20, certified to the President of the Senate under date of March 23, 1910 (S. Doc. No. 451, 61st Cong., 2d sess.); and Richard Emmons and others, No. 10375, certified to the President of the Senate under date of December 28, 1906 (S. Doc. No. 172, 59th Cong., 2d sess.), and the said court is hereby authorized to proceed in said cases as if no return therein had been made to the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 2893) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Howard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN (by request):

A bill (S. 2894) to provide for and regulate the issue of circulating notes by banks and banking associations of deposit and discount organized and doing business under general incorporation acts of any State or Territory in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

A bill (S. 2895) requiring railroads and other common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to make prompt acknowledgment and adjustment of claims for overcharge on freight, and for loss and injury to same; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 2896) to restore Jacob Linebough to the rolls of the Army and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2897) granting a pension to Lewis White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 2898) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Mooney; and

A bill (S. 2899) granting an increase of pension to Levi Toney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2900) to amend paragraph 500 of the act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," relating to the free entry of returned American animals (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2901) giving pensionable status to certain widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2902) to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to remit the specific penalty under subsection 8 of section 38 of the act approved August 5, 1909, in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2903) providing for the military status of John Gray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 2904) to confer upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to regulate the operation and equipment of the vehicles of the Metropolitan Coach Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STONE (for Mr. REED):

A bill (S. 2905) for the relief of Sanger & Moody (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2906) for the relief of John H. Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

(By request.) A bill (S. 2907) to correct the military record of and issue to James Capehart an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(By request.) A bill (S. 2908) granting an increase of pension to Marion Cunningham; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 2909) for the relief of John K. Wren; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 2910) granting an increase of pension to Aaron T. Currier; to the Committee on Pensions.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSANGER TO COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 85), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals is hereby authorized to employ a messenger at a salary of \$1,200 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON CANADIAN RELATIONS.

Mr. OLIVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Canadian Relations is hereby authorized to employ an assistant clerk at a salary of \$1,800 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

TELEGRAPH SERVICE IN SENATE OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Vice President is hereby authorized to direct the institution of the departmental telegraph instruments in the Senate

Office Building, and provide competent service therein, at a compensation of not to exceed \$1,800 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST LANDS IN ALASKA.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate of the United States copies of all letters, maps, executive or departmental orders or instructions, surveys, also applications to enter land, or for rights of way of railroads or otherwise, and all other official reports, recommendations, documents, or records in the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, or by any of the officials or bureaus of these departments, not included in the report of the Secretary of the Interior of April 26, 1911, printed as Senate Document No. 12, Sixty-second Congress, first session, relating in any way to the elimination from the Chugach National Forest in Alaska of land fronting upon Controller Bay, approximating 12,800 acres; especially referring to such papers, documents, etc., as relate to applications of the Controller Railroad & Navigation Co. for rights of way or confirmation of its maps of rights of way or harbor rights or privileges in or near to the said Controller Bay, or upon the Chugach National Forest, or upon lands eliminated therefrom, or upon tide lands or shore lands of the said Controller Bay, with such information, if any, as is in the possession of the War Department, relating to the character of Controller Bay as a harbor, its soundings, and a designation of those portions of the harbor which are available for the use of deep-water vessels.

Also, to include in the report hereby requested the names of the soldiers whose claims are to be used as bases for the applications for the land referred to, the mesne and subsequent assignments, and other data relating thereto, with a statement of the present status of all said applications to enter said lands or for rights of way thereon.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, after a long contest, extending over more than two years, the attempt to monopolize the vast coal deposits of the Bering River coal fields has been defeated, so far as the acquisition of title to the said coal lands is concerned, by the decision of the Secretary of the Interior in the so-called Cunningham coal claims case June 26, 1911.

It now seems evident that the interests which were seeking to monopolize the natural resources of Alaska were not dependent entirely upon one method. Control of transportation and access to these coal fields is equivalent to control of the coal itself. The harbor of Controller Bay, which is protected by a double natural breakwater, is the only available protected deep-water harbor within reasonable access to these coal fields. Realizing this fact, the national administration, February 26, 1909, withdrew from public entry that portion of the shore lines of Controller Bay which was essential in the use of its harbor and navigable channel. This left the situation so that the use of this harbor could be preserved for the public or granted upon such conditions as would insure it against monopoly. However, on October 28, 1910, without notice, this shore line, by Executive order, was restored to public entry, and immediately thereafter, before the public were advised of this fact, one James J. Ryan and others who are connected with the Controller Railroad & Navigation Co. made application to enter certain portions of the shore of Controller Bay which, with the incidental rights incident thereto and harbor privileges for which they had made application to the Government, will give them a complete monopoly of the use of Controller Bay as a harbor and of the sole practicable and available deep-water access to the Bering River coal fields. The rights so applied for have not yet matured or been confirmed, and in order that the fraudulent monopoly which was defeated by the decision of the Secretary of the Interior in the Cunningham coal cases should not be acquired by these other means of the monopoly of Controller Bay, and in order that the benefit of this very excellent act of the present administration should not be entirely lost, the status of these applications and all of the transactions leading up to the same should be thoroughly investigated and made public.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will move to insert at the proper place in the resolution the words "if not incompatible with the public interest." I presume the Senator from Washington will agree to that amendment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington accepts the amendment. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "requested" insert "if not incompatible with the public interest."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a minute. I came in after the resolution had been partly read. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington whether it provides for the publication of the report as a public document?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; it does not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It simply asks for the information.

Mr. POINDEXTER. When the report is made, I shall ask that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. Then will be time enough, after the report comes in.

PRICES OF SUGAR IN PRINCIPAL MARKETS.

Mr. GRONNA. I have received from the Department of Commerce and Labor 15 tables, prepared in the Bureau of Statistics, showing the movement of sugar prices in the principal European and American markets during the more recent period, together with prices for standard grades of both raw and refined sugar. I ask that the matter be printed as a public document. (S. Doc. No. 55.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I will state that I have examined the paper, and it brings the sugar prices down to date. I have no objection at all to the printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the order is entered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 12109. An act to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the reciprocity measure, House bill 4412.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, our predecessors have proceeded primarily upon the principle that "he who does not first care for his own household is worse than an infidel," but they did not ignore its corollary, viz, in a republic that household is related to every other in a measure, and he who will not recognize those relations and accept whatever enlarges the real benefits of his household by extending rights and benefits to others is something less than highly christianized. Tariffs are, in a measure, restraints upon trade; but in order to maintain a country at its highest efficiency in trade, industry, and for international peace and amity, it must develop its own resources and encourage diversity of enterprise by offering proper inducement to the investment of capital in those things which can and ought to be done here through the employment of American genius and American labor, at the highest possible wage and standard of living. To attain this highest condition it is necessary that a tariff approximately equal to the difference in cost of production here and abroad be imposed upon competing articles seeking entrance into the United States from countries having a lower standard of wages and living than ours. With this as a rule, and omitting for the time the question of revenue, it would seem that it was the clear duty of the United States, and for its best good, to enter into the freest relations possible with those nations where the conditions of living and industry are similar to those of our own country.

Does the Dominion of Canada come within the class of nations to which such description applies? After the most careful and unbiased study of which I am capable, I believe that it does. We have now reached the time when the individual Senator must decide this matter for himself, and I feel that I must vote for the agreement entered into by the representatives of the two countries. Personally, I would not have brought it forward at this time and in this form if I had been in control of the matter. I would have striven hard and long for a treaty which would have included all of the products of Canadian and United States industries in the free list, for I am convinced that reciprocity with Canada can never be the greatest success until manufactured, as well as natural products, meet no customs wall in passing between the two countries. Under the pending measure there will be too many opportunities for national changes and discriminations in tariffs for its unquestioned permanence and safety. Furthermore, the country is being disturbed in its every industrial part by pending and threatening tariff revisions; and if depression comes, as I fear it may, reciprocity will be credited with being the entering wedge of business disaster, and repudiation may be the result. I am sorry that some Senators feel that it is the part of good statesmanship to indulge so extensively in extravagant and inflammatory statements and in such peculiar methods intended

to complicate the passage of the measure, but which may result in embarrassment to its administration when enacted into law.

But the matter is here in this form. It has been presented by a Republican President, whom nobody has openly charged with mercenary or improper motives, and it is not out of harmony with the time-honored principle of a Republican protective tariff. That principle is, in effect, that duties should be levied only upon imports from nations where the cost of production is substantially less than the cost in this country. The cost of production in Canada of the products included in the pending measure is not materially, if it is any, less than the cost of production of such articles in the United States. The people of the two countries are the same in blood, in civilization, in methods of living, in ideals, and in destiny. Indeed, people from the States are almost as numerous in many parts of Canada as those born under the British Jack, and the percentage of Canadian-born citizens in the United States is very large. We are closer neighbors to Canada in every sense of the word than we are to any other nation on earth. If the fortune and circumstance of post-Revolutionary treaties had not arbitrarily fixed the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes, and the forty-ninth parallel, instead of 54° 40', as the boundary line between Canada and the United States, no voice would now be raised against a bigger America. It would have seemed in the eternal fitness of things that there should be one great economic unit in habitable America north of the Gulf of Mexico. It is one country by nature, but in the economy of man it has been made into two, accompanied by all the economic waste of separate organizations. There is little hope or prospect that one flag will float over Washington and Ottawa, but surely two nations bound so closely together by nature should not be separated by commercial and industrial barriers. Several times in our history we have been close to commercial freedom with Canada, and at one fatal hour we were close to national unity. I say fatal, not that the union would have been disastrous, but because the hour was untimely struck. The occasion was not right. Had no unusual or unforeseen difficulties arisen during the continuance of the Marcy-Elgin treaty of 1854-1866, I believe by this time there would have been no trade controversy over Canada, for there would have been but one commercial flag on the Western Continent north of Mexico. Feeling in the United States during the Civil War was embittered by British sympathy with the southern cause, and Canada became the asylum for southern sympathizers. The *Alabama* was fitted out in British ports and waters to prey upon and harass the interests of the United States. The treaty period, unfortunately, ended about the time of the close of the war. The sentiment of the North was hostile to everything pro-British. The *Alabama* claims came up for settlement, and in the later sixties there was a general feeling throughout this country that the proper compensation for England to make to the United States was to cede Canada to it. Senator Sumner, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, openly advocated annexation, and in the early part of 1870 Secretary of State Hamilton Fish urged upon England's ambassador, Sir Edward Thornton, the advisability of England's withdrawal from Canada. The ambassador was instructed to consent to this proposition if Canada would take the initiative, but this Canada refused to do, owing to the intense feeling which had grown up as the result of the events of the Civil War and of the revocation by the United States of the treaty of 1854.

Before and at the time of the Elgin treaty there was much talk of union between Canada and the United States. But at that time the dissensions over slavery between the two sections of our country impeded, if they did not prevent, annexation. The North was for annexation—the South was against it and advocated reciprocity in trade as a preventive of union. The addition of Canada to the United States would be increasing free territory, for slavery could not exist in the North. Indeed, the pages of the history of our relations with Canada seem full of untimely and unsuccessful efforts at union and reciprocity, and it has been impossible to strike the time and occasion right. The people of both countries have not, however, given up hope, and still express a longing for those mutual advantages which are possible in unrestricted commercial intercourse.

The bill before us is not a realization of our hopes and desires. It is, however, a distinct recognition of international comity. It is an agreement to begin taking down the useless wall between parts of the same industrial field. It is the best that can be obtained now. Shall we refuse to begin a universally acknowledged good work when we have the chance simply because it does not begin or end at the place we would have selected? Or because we are piqued at the architect who laid out the plans? Or because the scheme does not and can not contain all of our notions as to what should be in it? If

we wait for such objections to disappear we will never begin. Let us accept it with the hope that none of the extraneous difficulties encountered in the past shall intervene, and that once engaged in the work of friendship we shall become better friends and together shall understand that the removal of the ugly and useless barriers to trade will extend Canada's horizon to the south and that of the United States to the north, so that the eye of industry may sweep with unbroken vision from Hudsons Bay to the Gulf of Mexico.

But, Mr. President, we are told that this measure will inure to the benefit of Canada and work to the detriment of the United States; and as proof of this the proponents of that theory bring forward those arguments, and only those, which could with equal force be urged against reciprocity among the States. The United States lies between the two oceans; so does Canada. The United States is in the North Temperate Zone; so is habitable Canada. The United States lies south and Canada north of an imaginary line which can not be located except by a surveyor. The only difference is that Canada, being north, shades into the Frigid Zone, and for every degree it extends north from our northern boundary the season for agriculture is shortened and the risks from frosts and droughts increase. It is probable that in time much of the agricultural land of Canada will be utilized for wheat. This will occur as fast as the world's demand encourages it. This development will take place in full measure only when and because such demand shall warrant the higher price which the additional risks will make necessary. I know that many men have sold their developed high-priced lands in the States and have gone into Canada to take up the lower-priced lands there in the hope that the rise in value of these virgin lands will bring them a fortune in a few years. It is the same idea which actuates men to buy even intrinsically worthless land near a growing city. They expect that the city in its growth will some day reach them, when their property will warrant draining, filling, and platting for city property. Some of these immigrants to Canada will have the endurance and strength and financial ability to abide the time, which is sure to come, when from the increase in land values they will reap their reward; but for me, I would prefer to clear a farm from among the forests and stump barrens of Michigan than to encounter the frosts and privations of northern Canada. Already hundreds of disappointed Americans are wending their way back to the United States—"God's country," as they call it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Gladly.

Mr. BORAH. Notwithstanding that fact, 100,000 Americans last year left the United States and went to Canada, and have become permanent citizens there.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Last year 124,000 people went from the United States into Canada. I am not prepared to say what proportion of them were native-born Americans. I know that 94,000 people left Canada and came into the United States during that time, and I do know that of that number 23,000 were men who had lived in the United States and had gone into Canada and come back.

Mr. BORAH. Those who left Canada and came back were not of the same element of the producing classes as those who left the United States and went into Canada. They were following other vocations. I know that there are now a million and a half Canadians in this country, but they are not engaged in farming.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not prepared to dispute that statement, because I have not investigated as to the particular vocations which those people entered. I simply know that the report shows that 124,000 people from the United States went into Canada last year and 94,000 from Canada came here. This means that the percentage of immigration from Canada into the United States is larger than the percentage of emigration from the United States into Canada.

But Canada will, in the course of time, be developed, and hundreds of millions of bushels of hardy short-seasoned wheat will be produced; but I repeat, that will be when there is a market for it and that market will be caused by the increased consumption of wheat and by the decreased production in other at present wheat-growing sections. To-day the production of wheat in the United States is the greatest in the history of our country, and it will never be less; but only about one farmer in five grows wheat. I ought to say also that while it is charged that Canada is rapidly increasing her wheat production, last year she produced 17,000,000 bushels less than she did the year before, and that her agricultural products in 1910 amounted to something like \$26,000,000 less than they did in 1909.

Gradually the longer-settled portions of this country are abandoning the culture of wheat for more profitable products, and when the natural wheat-producing soil is exhausted it is turned over to other uses, and as wheat growing decreases, in proportion to consumption, the price will tend to rise, and those who are wedded to wheat culture, and can not be divorced from it, will be consoled by the fact that it will pay them to so fertilize the soil and cultivate the crop as to obtain a proper return for their toil and outlay.

To-day if all the surplus wheat of Canada found an outlet through American markets, it would not, in my opinion, materially affect the price. If we used Canada's export we could and would export more of our own crop. But we will not use it. The surplus from both countries will continue to find its market abroad except in case of a crop failure in either country. Then the other country will supply, as it ought to supply, the deficiency.

I do not believe there is any prospect of the supply of wheat outrunning the demand. It is true that for years the trend of population has been away from the farm and to the city, but that simply increased the demand for wheat. Producers have become consumers.

But, Mr. President, the opponents of this measure base their prophecies of disaster to the farmers upon the proposition that Canadian prices are lower than United States prices, and wheat is the overworked item of illustration. Now, I can see no good reason for arguing that because prices are higher in one country than they are in another therefore the country of higher prices will be injured by a removal of duties. Some have also contended as though it was the business of the Government to insure selling prices. When before did the advocates of protection ever publicly announce that a tariff was inaugurated to increase prices? When infant industries which ought to have been established in this country were seeking to establish themselves it was the policy of the Republican Party to afford protection against the stronger and better organized institutions abroad, and under those circumstances the Government was properly generous, but when such industries here have become established, then no one has intelligently urged that a duty should be retained for protection except in cases where, by reason of higher wages paid and other greater legitimate expenses incurred, the cost of production to our producers was materially greater than the cost to our competitors, and I at least have always had in mind that this system would induce competition among our producers which would eventually cheapen products to the consumer. And it has done so.

In other words, I have believed, and I still believe, that we should protect those, and only those, of our home industries which should exist here in which the legitimate cost of production is materially greater than it is with their competitors, and then only to the extent of the difference in such cost, and this means that cost and not selling price is the basis for fixing tariffs.

But let us take, for argument's sake, the position assumed by the opponents of this measure, removal or reduction of duties means a loss to the country of higher prices. Measured by their standard, will the bill, if enacted into law, be a financial detriment to our farmer?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to ask the Senator there upon what theory, then, has it been that the Republican Party has universally, since the repeal of the treaty in 1865, opposed this kind of an arrangement with Canada? Upon what basis has it made its objection if it were not for the purpose of protecting the price of the farmer in the sale of his products?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not believe that the Republican Party or that Republicans generally have universally opposed such a treaty with Canada. I am convinced, after having read the history of all the relations between this country and Canada, that there has been a disposition on the part of the people of this country and of Canada to establish just such mutual relations as are now proposed and that disposition existed even before the treaty of 1854.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator now to take the time to do so, but I will before very long show the Senator that the Republican Party in every campaign where the issue has been up, including the campaign which brought the present administration into power, specifically denounced the lowering of the duties between this country and Canada for fear of reducing the price of the products of the farmer.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But, Mr. President, if it shall be demonstrated that that fear is not well founded; if at the same time we are preserving the real fundamental principle of the Republican protective tariff or Republican protection, namely, a duty which measures the difference in the cost of production, are we not still proceeding according to Republican notions and doctrines?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; if it should be demonstrated; but there would be another interesting question arise then, and that is when the demonstration took place and what was the cause of the change which produced the change of position in the party on that subject?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall have to differ from the Senator from Idaho in his assertion that the party has changed its position on that subject. I may have been peculiar in my environment and my relations politically, but I have never understood any other doctrine as the one adopted by the Republican Party than the one I have announced to-day.

I am insisting, Mr. President, that the basis for fixing a tariff has never been the selling price, but rather the cost of production. But if for argument sake we shall agree that it is the business of Government to see to it that prices are higher in the United States than they are in Canada, and that by reducing the tariff between this and that country on articles that would come in to compete, we would thereby reduce the selling price here and injure the producer. I say, assuming that all this is true for argument sake—and it is the only way I will assume it to be true—let us see what we will get from this particular bill; let us see exactly what must result if we are to apply that doctrine as I propose to apply it now.

Let us refer to wheat again. During the last 19 years wheat has fluctuated in price in Canada and in the United States. In 1890, 1891, 1897, 1899, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1900 wheat was higher in the United States than it was in Winnipeg. In some of those years the difference was negligible. During the years 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1900, 1901, and 1908 wheat was higher in Winnipeg than it was in Chicago. This shows that during 11 of the last 19 years wheat averaged higher in the United States than it did in Canada, and during 8 of those 19 years it averaged lower in the United States than in Canada. Now, if we apply the standard heretofore mentioned and say that the United States farmer would have lost on his wheat during the designated 11 years when wheat was higher in the United States than it was in Canada, if the United States tariff had been removed, shall we not be obliged to apply the same doctrine, per contra, and assert with equal certainty that he would have gained during the 8 years when wheat was higher in Canada than it was in the United States if the Canadian tariff had been removed?

If such would be the logical result of this theory, will it not be necessary to figure up and strike a balance by arithmetical calculation before we know whether the farmer would have been injured by free trade in wheat with Canada? What is true of wheat is even more marked in reference to other farm products. During practically all of the last 19 years corn, oats, milk, hogs and hog products, and sheep have been higher in Canada than in the United States, and every farm product has, during some of the last 19 years, been higher in Canada than it has been in the United States.

How will gentlemen escape from the conclusion which their own logic produces? If a removal of all duties on agricultural products reduces values in some cases, it must, by the same token, increase them in others.

I have heard much about the failure of the bill to reduce the duty on articles which the farmer uses. Have gentlemen read the bill so carelessly as to have overlooked the fact that lumber is on the free list; and if the duty imposes extra cost to the consumer, then certainly it is the lumberman and not the farmer who will be injured by a remission of this duty, for the latter will not have his lumber charged with a tariff duty of \$1.25 per thousand. Shall he not be credited with this item?

The bill provides that the duty of 45 per cent on hay loaders, potato diggers, feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, rollers, and hay tedders shall be reduced to 25 per cent, or a reduction of 45 per cent.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator from Michigan object to interruptions?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator wishes to make a continuous speech I will not interrupt him.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I should not like to be interrupted for a speech, but for a question I shall be very willing to yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Has the Senator made any estimate of what the average farmer would gain in a period of 10 or 15

years if he got the full benefit of the reduction of a dollar and a quarter a thousand upon his lumber?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I have not. It would be very small.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is a matter of fact that an ordinary frame house will last about 45 years, is it not?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Well, I should think so.

Mr. McCUMBER. There are about 10,000 feet of lumber in the ordinary farmhouse. And if that was the case, saving a dollar and a half on a thousand feet would be a saving of \$15 on his lumber bill once in 45 years, or 33 cents a year; something like that. Would you consider that an important element to balance against a loss of 25 cents on barley for every bushel he would raise?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have shown, unless I have failed, that these articles vary in prices, sometimes higher and sometimes lower in Canada than they are in the United States. I have just begun an enumeration of some of the items. Now, I am going to admit to the Senator from North Dakota that I do not take very much stock in this notion that the removal of the duty on lumber or on wheat is going to make any appreciable difference in the price of either one of them—and I am referring to lumber and other products in order to apply the rule laid down by Senators who insist that the selling price shall be the standard for fixing the tariff.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator why he goes back 19 or 20 years and gives us a general conclusion of a period of 20 years or 19 years, the most of which years were in a period in which, on account of our enormous surplus, we were compelled to sell upon the basis of foreign values, while, when we had reduced our surplus so that it was almost nothing, in 1909 and in 1910, or reduced it so very low, the home demand rather than the foreign demand applies? Why does he not take up those years for a comparison, and if he will take the last three or four years he will find there has never been a time, unless through a cornering of the market at some particular period, in which the Canadian price under like conditions would come within from 10, and sometimes within as high as 20, cents a bushel as our wheat, and when our flax crop was short and when our barley crop was short, as within the last year, there was a difference of fully 30 cents a bushel on each of them.

It seems to me the Senator ought to take those years, because those years meet our present condition, and they foreshadow what we may expect in the future from Canada.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from North Dakota I will state that the reason I went back to 1890 was because that was the first year about which I can obtain statistics in Canada as to the price of products. I asked for a compilation to be made from 1850 to date. I submit that the method I have pursued is the only fair one to pursue in this matter.

The Senator seems to think that there were some unusual conditions which existed a few years ago which created a large surplus, and that the latter few years are the only ones to be governed by. Peculiar conditions are found in all periods. I have felt that we should take the country with all of the conditions which can be found only through a period of years. And I have taken every year that we have any reports on from Canada and the United States, in order that there might be no charge that there has been a juggling of figures or dates for the purpose of meeting the emergency.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator will pardon me. There is no question about the accuracy of his figures. But while the figures will always speak accurately, they speak accurately only of a condition at the time. The same figures applied to certain conditions now will produce entirely different results. For instance, the Senator will admit that a very little surplus has a big influence in driving prices down, and a very little shortage has a great influence in pushing prices up. Therefore, figures and conditions that applied to years when we were producing an enormous surplus and Canada was producing little surplus, we will say per capita, because that is the fairer estimate, are entirely different when applied to conditions in which we are practically consuming all that we produce, and Canada, on the other hand, has an enormous surplus which is still growing.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But which is still growing less. As I stated a moment ago, Canada's production last year was 17,000,000 bushels less than it was in 1909, and her exportations were \$26,000,000 worth of agricultural products less than it was—

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly. But the Senator undoubtedly informed the Senate at the time that there was almost no crop in all that northwestern country, and that year has nothing to do with the possibilities of that country, because all the statistics, Canadian and American, agree that Canada has land

there on which she can produce from one to five billion bushels of wheat.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did not mention that suggestion. I ought to have done it for another reason, and that was to emphasize the fact, as I stated a moment ago, that because of Canada's peculiar geographical location, she has to meet the exigencies of drought and frost, which would make her not a dangerous competitor of the United States one year with another.

The bill further provides that manure spreaders and windmills—and I call the particular attention of those politicians and lobbyists who are so solicitous of the farmers' interests to these items, manure spreaders and windmills—it provides, I say, that the duty on these articles shall be reduced from 45 per cent to 20 per cent, or a reduction in duty of 55 per cent.

I am not presenting this information, I will say to the Senator, because I believe the American farmer is going to get his tools any cheaper by this reduction. I am simply presenting it, however, because if you are going to apply this doctrine, that a reduction of duty means a reduction in price, you must apply it to all of the articles in order to have it fair, because I think it works as clearly in one case as it does in another.

If this rule, which opponents of the bill have invoked, is applied to some items, I must insist that it be applied to all items, and then the account balanced through profit and loss.

But if Canada is really getting the best of the bargain, what a misguided, misinformed lot of farmers and statesmen and newspaper men there are in the Dominion. From the St. Thomas (Ontario) Daily Times of Saturday, June 10, 1911, I clipped the following:

ONLY 2 STOOD UP IN FAVOR OF PACT OUT OF 143 FARMERS AT RECIPROCITY MEETING AT STRAFFORDVILLE ON FRIDAY NIGHT—STRONG RESOLUTION.

STRAFFORDVILLE, June 10.

The largest mass meeting held here in the last 25 years was the gathering addressed in the town hall on Friday night by splendid speakers on the question of reciprocity. The speakers were the same as were at Aymer the previous night, except that T. W. Crothers, M. P., of St. Thomas, was not present, namely, David Marshall, M. P.; Richard Blain, M. P. for Peel; Joseph E. Armstrong, M. P. for East Lambton; C. A. Brower, M. P.; W. A. Jones, president Bayham Liberal-Conservative Association, chairman; and Dr. Johnston, of Port Burwell, secretary Bayham Liberal-Conservative Association. By actual count there were 143 farmers present, and all listened with attention and frequent applause to the excellent speeches.

A STIRRING RESOLUTION.

A stirring resolution disapproving of the proposed reciprocity agreement was submitted to the audience, and with but two exceptions every man rose to his feet in unqualified approval of the resolution, which was as follows:

"Resolved, That, in the opinion of this meeting, reciprocity between Canada and the United States would be against the best interests of the Canadian people, and we heartily indorse the stand taken by Mr. R. L. Borden and David Marshall, our esteemed representatives, on this question and hope that they will compel the Government to submit the question to the electors of Canada for their decision."

Those 141 farmers evidently do not understand this bill as its opponents here understand it. I confess I believe there is more reason for fear of the measure on the part of Canada than there is on the part of our people, and yet I do not think that anything but real good can eventually come to either country on account of its enactment. It would, however, be easier for me to conjure up fear of injury from the treaty if I were a Canadian than it is for me, an American, to imagine injury from it.

One must be particularly impressed with the arguments against this proposition by the Hon. George E. Foster, M. P., in the May number of the North American Review of this year. Mr. Foster is a member of the privy council, was educated in New Brunswick, at Edinburgh, and at Heidelberg, and has been minister of marine and minister of finance for Canada. He surely seems to be qualified to speak, and his experience in and knowledge of Canadian affairs and conditions entitles his opinions to great consideration. I submit an abstract of some parts of his article in the North American Review:

It (the Canadian reciprocity bill) has been condemned by the Boards of Trade of Toronto, Winnipeg, and Montreal, and by the Associate Boards of Trade of Ontario; by the Food Growers' Association of Ontario and British Columbia; by the market gardeners, by the business, banking, industrial, and transport interests, and by the Legislatures of New Brunswick, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Ontario. The Elgin-Marcy treaty was terminated against the wish of Canada. Canada's answer was the confederation of the disconnected Provinces, the evolution of a strong Canadian ideal, and the birth of a new nation. From that moment a new alignment of forces and a new trend of development superseded the ideals and plans of the past. The agreement narrows and restricts our (Canada's) fiscal freedom. It might temporarily suit our prairie Provinces, which raise no fruit, if fruit came in free from the United States; but if this deprived Ontario and British Columbia, which are large producers of fruit, of their market in these Provinces, and, in addition, exposed them to a ruinous competition in their own home market, the result would be otherwise than beneficial to Canadian development as a whole. It would shift the best of a profitable production from Canada to the United States, diminish the volumes of inter-provincial traffic, and retard the home development of the food industry.

The pact is urged upon Canada on the ground that it opens to our farmers a market of 90,000,000 people. How much of that 90,000,000 market is accessible to our eggs, butter, cheese, fruits, vegetables, live stock, grain, and meat productions? Distance and cost of transport cut out nine-tenths and more. The remaining fraction is scattered along 4,000 miles of frontier, and its demands are modified by contingencies of seasons and localities. Even then our products, where they go, must compete with similar products raised near by and with cheaper access and better organized distribution.

But we can not forget that the same pact opens up the markets of Canada to the competition of 12 times as many producers whose seasonal and sectional surplus can be poured into the present home markets of our producers: the vast organized collecting and distributing trusts in meats, provisions, and agricultural products could easily flood our more accessible markets and become formidable competitors of our less highly organized producers and distributors. They have also to contend with climatic disadvantages in many lines of production, such as added feeding and fuel expenses, in more rigorous weather conditions, and in later and shorter seasons, which handicap them in comparison with more southern competitors.

Both your parties—

He refers to the two parties in the United States—

are protectionist, and apparently intend to remain so. Yet you offer to Canada free trade in all products, though you refuse it to the rest of the world. Why? You want extended markets for your manufactures, and you see to the north 8,000,000 consumers likely to be increased to 100,000,000 by the end of the century. You are becoming less and less exporters of food and raw materials and more and more exporters of finished products. Your natural resources are gradually diminishing, while Canada has immense virgin supplies. Access to this country will give you exactly what you desire in this respect. You will be able to replenish your depleted stores of raw material, carry on your manufacturing processes more profitably, and sell the finished products in the northern markets. In a word, you desire to make Canada for trade purposes like unto a State of the Union, except that you do not propose to employ your capital within her borders. You will draw her raw resources to your very own country and work them up by your very own people, and, of course, reap the profits.

The reciprocity pact cuts straight across this development and this ideal, disconnects our Provinces, attacks our industries, taps our east and west connections by north and south lines, and menaces our national solidarity.

Is it not strange that the Canadian boards of trade, food growers' associations, market gardeners, and farmers should oppose a measure which will bring them all the benefits which the opponents of this measure in the United States find in it for the Canadians?

This bill can not harm the farmers. It is the beginning of a policy which I have long favored, viz, a change of tariff conditions in conformity with the well-understood theory of protection. The items in this measure are clearly understood. We know what the cost of production is here and in Canada. As fast as the facts can be obtained in reference to other items and other countries the tariff schedules should be revised and a scientific system of duties established.

I want the wool, cotton, steel, and other schedules revised if a determination of facts disclose that revision is needed. I will not, however, close my eyes and blindly proceed in the matter. I do not believe that the people have repudiated the principle of protection. They have protested against old, unscientific methods. They want to know from competent authority what the difference in cost of production is in order that a duty equalizing that difference can be imposed.

Gentlemen have constructed a scarecrow from the bill of such hideous mien that they have become greatly frightened at their own creation. But, Mr. President, if the good which comes from this measure shall be confined to the benefits which flow directly and immediately from it, and they shall be all that can be expected, it will hardly be worth the political strife and bitterness which it has engendered, but to me it is only an incident to greater things which must grow out of it.

He who looks at the map of North America, after he has rubbed out all artificial political lines, sees a country of fields and forests, of mountains and plains, of rivers and lakes, of mineral and agricultural resources, distributed with lavish hand by the Great Creator of all, and yet not recklessly, but with almost apparent design.

The natural needs of one section can be readily supplied from another and one thus becomes the complement of the other. It is man's business to develop these natural resources and distribute where needed. If you look at that map you will see that nature's commercial highways are the lakes and rivers and seas, and they are not private but they are public highways. The Mississippi with its great tributaries connect the southern and middle western portions of this domain with the Gulf of Mexico. The Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence reach from the very heart of the continent to the Atlantic Ocean, and with these waterways fully developed, utilized, and controlled the transportation problems would be practically solved.

We have now settled the question of boundary between the United States and Canada. No fishery disputes disturb the amity of the two countries. An international high commission has been provided, to which all disputes will be submitted for settlement—the perplexing questions of international rates of common carriers have been cared for. This bill will be, we hope,

a step in the direction of commercial peace and harmony. Thus the way will be open for the beginning of the final and greatest achievement of all, viz, the opening up to the mighty commerce of Canada and the United States a deep waterway from the Lakes to the ocean through that international stream, the St. Lawrence River.

And now, Mr. President, I desire in as brief a time as possible to discuss the amendment which I have offered to the so-called Canadian reciprocity measure and give to Senators the reasons which induced me to offer and support it.

May I ask the Secretary to read the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section to the bill, as follows:

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of improving the St. Lawrence River from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean and waterways connecting the Great Lakes, the President of the United States is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the Dominion of Canada which shall provide, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, for a waterway of sufficient depth and width to accommodate deep-water or seagoing vessels for the common use and benefit of both countries and in furtherance of reciprocal trade relations between them: *Provided, however*, That said agreement before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is probable that the provision is not as well worded as it might be, but it is sufficiently clear to enable the Congress to understand it and the President to comprehend its intent, if it shall be presented to him for his action. It clearly does not affect the provisions of the bill, or any of them. It simply instructs the President to continue his efforts for the further reciprocal good of Canada and the United States.

I will, as best I can, present some of the benefits which would come to the people of the United States and of Canada from a deep or ocean waterway from the Great Lakes to the ocean, via the St. Lawrence River, and then I will discuss the feasibility of the project.

I think I realize some of the objections which will be urged against this amendment, and I confess that I have no hope of accomplishing its object until the utmost trust and confidence, the most complete faith and good will, exist between the people of the United States and Canada.

Being convinced that the project which I propose will confer greater benefits on both countries than those which flow from any tariff—that it would be, in fact, the consummation of the greatest contemplated benefits in trade—I seek to project it upon the attention of the Senate and of the country.

It is commonly accepted as true that the industrial and commercial progress of the world has depended in direct ratio upon the progress and development of the means of transportation.

In their primitive state mankind have been content to produce only what they have desired, and their desires were limited to the simple needs for satisfying hunger and for protection against the elements. But when their desires were increased and they wanted other than what they individually produced, the carrier or transporter became a necessity. At first the means of transportation were crude vehicles, hauled by men or animals on land, and equally crude boats and canoes, propelled by oars or wind on the water. The latter was the most efficient, and settlements followed the course of streams and waterways. But these streams and waterways were limited and only penetrated a small portion of the country. Watercourses were nature's highways, and to the people who could use them they furnished cheap means of transportation.

The interior portions of the country were in many cases more fertile and productive than land adjacent to navigable waters. Minerals of great value existed in places remote from water, and as these lands and minerals came into demand land transportation received attention. In due course the railroad was born and the country was settled up. Railroad building at first was slow, but as the possibilities of railroading, both speculative and practical, became more apparent, as inventive genius became more active, railroad companies were formed and lines constructed. There was a real contest for railroad business. That was before the age of consolidation. In time roads sufficient for the ordinary needs of industry were constructed; then began the struggle of railroad operators for monopoly; then began the age of consolidation. It was, however, a consolidation of railroads. The boat lines were independent, and wherever they existed they furnished real competition.

This Government has recognized the value of water transportation. It has spent \$650,000,000 in improving its rivers and harbors, and has entered upon a most extensive and comprehensive policy of waterway improvement. It is seeking vigorously and intelligently, though not yet altogether effectively, to regulate land carriers; but about the only thing which

has effectively resulted in securing low and reasonable rail rates has been the establishment of water competition.

No one complains of rail rates between the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, for these coasts are connected by the two oceans, and the land rate must meet the ocean rate. The charges by rail from Duluth to Buffalo are reasonable, because the lake boats make them so. The freight tariffs from the East or West to the Mississippi River are much lower than those over the same lines to nearer points from place of shipment but which have not the actual or possible advantages of Mississippi navigation. Indeed, the Salt Lake City merchant who buys goods in Boston or New York bills them through his home to the Pacific coast and then back to Salt Lake City, for the reason it is cheaper to do so. The Arizona wool buyer first ships his wool to Los Angeles and then across the continent to Boston, because the latter rate is fixed to meet ocean competition. The railroads haul coal from the Pennsylvania mines to Chicago at a lower rate than they do to Jackson, Mich., 200 miles nearer the mine, and for the reason that Chicago is on Lake Michigan, which is connected by water with Lake Erie, upon which the city of Erie is situated, and the coal might be shipped by rail to Erie and thence by boat to Chicago. Water competition is the one sure power which compels low freight rates.

This principle is generally recognized by States and by the Nation. He who investigates with care will discover that the freight rate enters into the cost of practically everything of human use, and its effect upon articles of consumption is to increase the cost far in excess of any increase caused by tariff duties.

Centuries ago European Governments recognized the necessity of common carriers and treated them as public servants. The old common law of England, adopted by the United States, provides that the rates and regulations of common carriers shall be just and reasonable. To the end that they shall be such, statutes have been enacted, and in recent years railroad-rate legislation has been the most important of Federal and State enactments.

The problem of cheap transportation is still unsolved; but already water transportation is recognized as the prime factor in the solution.

The Great Lakes extend into the very heart of the United States. Tributary to them is the most fertile territory of our country. On them and within an hour's ride from them are found our largest and most prosperous industries.

The iron, copper, coal, tin, salt, and other minerals of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, and western Pennsylvania would naturally find their way to markets over the Lakes if a deep waterway for ocean-going craft connected those Lakes with the Atlantic; the forest products of the great Middle Northwest could be floated to the ultimate consumer; railroads would have their termini on the inland seas, and to their waters could be carried the grain and other agricultural products for shipment to both shores of the Atlantic. Indeed, the Atlantic would be extended to Chicago and Duluth and a benefit to producers and shippers in the great Middle West, in excess of any other that has been suggested, would be extended. I can not easily overstate this benefit. Think of it, transportation for seagoing craft would be brought to within an hour of the center of population. At the docks of Duluth, Chicago, Port Arthur, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Erie, Buffalo, and Toronto could be seen ships flying the flags of England, Germany, Russia, and of every other maritime power of Europe. Cargoes could be loaded in bottoms at Lake ports bound directly for their foreign destination. The Interstate Commerce Commission would have no occasion to pass upon railroad rates from the Middle West to the Atlantic. Water competition would keep these rates reasonable.

But shipments from the Middle West and Northwest would not be the only ones benefited. Goods going into those regions from the East would not be charged with the present high freight rates. They would get the benefit of water competition.

There are other great benefits which would come from the establishment of this waterway. On the Lakes are some of the largest shipbuilding yards in the country. In them are constructed some of the largest ships afloat, and these yards could compete in construction with the seaboard yards, and such competition might be of great value to the Government and to the shipping interests on lakes and seas.

Session after session of Congress the country is notified of its dangerous lack of colliers for use with its gunboats in time of war, and yet our Great Lakes are covered with leviathans that could be used in case of need, and that without expense of building and maintaining by the Government in time of peace. How much better to spend \$150,000,000 in a waterway intrinsically worth the money, for commerce, and at the same time

furnish a way to get collier freighters to the sea in case of necessity, than to spend \$150,000,000 for boats which will probably never be needed. This is no idle fancy. The lake boats may not be constructed as a modern naval architect would build a collier, but they would answer the purpose, and are such as are now used in time of war. Many of the lake boats at the close of the lake season could go down to the sea and engage in the coastwise traffic in the winter season, and thus work the year round. On the other hand, a larger field will be opened to our coast-serving boats, and if it be true that a lake-boat monopoly exists, or is being formed, competition will tend to destroy it.

To me this scheme opens a possibility for a merchant marine without subsidy or other similar device. This waterway would induce the building, manning, and operation of seagoing boats on the Great Lakes.

The St. Lawrence River, with its sources in the very industrial and commercial heart of the continent, leads in a most direct line to the great marts of Europe. It invites the business of both countries to embark upon its waters. Nature never appealed more eloquent with advantages and opportunities than she does to these two countries through this waterway to-day.

I can already hear the objections which will be urged by representatives from the Atlantic seaboard of the United States. Already they think they see Montreal enlarged into the metropolis of the western continent, while New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore contemplate their idle wharves and empty warehouses; but, Mr. President, they are victims of hallucinations; they are but seeing nightmares in their dreams.

A sufficiently developed Welland Canal and St. Lawrence River would but stimulate railroad facilities and railroad advantages, and a practical waterway sufficient for the needs of ocean traffic, extending from Duluth to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, would be worth the cost to the people of the two countries, if but few additional boats sailed over the course, in the reduction of railroad rates and the additional railroad accommodations which would be furnished. This is one of the unquestioned lessons which such enterprises have taught the world.

But, Mr. President, believing, as I do, that this project would be for the good of the United States and Canada as a whole, I would still advocate it even if it should stop the phenomenal, nay, the somewhat dangerous, growth of our seaboard cities. But if great growth is the thing altogether lovely and most to be desired, what should we say of the possibilities in this regard which shall come to Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, Duluth, Chicago, and other cities as a result of this project?

As for me, sir, I would for the good of my country hasten the movement of the center of population westward into the neighborhood of our greatest natural resources, into the region where exist those somewhat latent forces which must shape and control the great destinies of ultimate America. But no disaster can come from this to any legitimate interest. It will stimulate growth and prosperity everywhere. In all prosperous times, in some seasons of all years, there is great complaint that traffic is retarded and great loss to business incurred by reason of insufficient shipping facilities. This plan would tend to relieve congestion by furnishing additional facilities and by inducing collateral railroad development.

I have suggested some of the benefits which would flow from a waterway such as I have proposed. I now desire, as briefly as may be, to discuss the feasibility of the plan, and in doing so I deeply sense the fact that I am not an engineer and that my utterances may be properly characterized as those of a novice. There are, however, some demonstrated facts, certain things in being, to which reference can be properly had and upon which I can draw for information, and thus, in a measure, and to that extent, relieve myself from the charge of speculation so long as the analogy is unquestioned.

One of these demonstrated facts is that a waterway for boats drawing not over 14 feet is already established and in operation on this proposed route now. Last year the total canal traffic of Canada was 42,990,608 tons, of which the Sault Ste. Marie Canal is credited with 36,395,687 tons, the Welland Canal with 2,326,290 tons, and the St. Lawrence canals with 2,760,752 tons, and the growth of this tonnage in late years has been most phenomenal. For instance, the total Canadian tonnage in 1901 was 5,665,259 tons; in 1905 it was 9,371,744; and in 1910 it was, as I have stated, 42,990,608 tons. Now, if boats of 14 feet draft can sail from Lake Erie to the Atlantic Ocean by means of canal and river improvement, is it fanciful to say that the largest boats after greater improvement can do the same?

In the first place, such a waterway as I propose must be practicable for the needs of navigation if it is to be undertaken. To be practicable, it must be so constructed and operated that boats may sail in reasonable safety, with proper dispatch, and under such international arrangements as will facilitate mutually the free and unnecessarily restricted commerce of both Canada and the United States.

The St. Lawrence River route has been selected, because it has sufficient water and takes, as I have stated, the most direct course to the great markets of Europe. Open-water sailing is greatly preferable to canal navigation. Greater speed is possible. Accidents are less imminent. The cost is materially less. Some canals with locks will be necessary to complete the project, but the fewer of these there are the more desirable and practicable the route.

I have stated that there already exists a waterway on this line for some boats. Canada alone has spent upon her locks and canals in the St. Lawrence, including the Cornwall Canal, and between Lakes Erie and Ontario about \$97,000,000. Owing to the small dimensions of the Welland Canal and locks and of those in the St. Lawrence and to certain Canadian regulations as to lockages on Sunday, and so forth, comparatively few American boats use the St. Lawrence route, although the number is increasing. Last year 692 American vessels passed through the St. Lawrence Canal, or, rather, 692 trips were made by American vessels.

If the locks and canals in the St. Lawrence and between Lakes Erie and Ontario are enlarged sufficiently, it will be possible for the largest boats to pass through them. Fortunately, the fall of water from Lake Erie to Montreal, which makes canals and locks necessary, also engenders the greatest dynamic force to be found on the continent. These moving waters contain a power which, properly harnessed and controlled, could drive a majority of all the machines of our mighty industries. And power is coming more and more into demand. To utilize that power dams below the rapids will have to be constructed. These dams will check the flow and create pools of deeper water over what before were rocks dangerous to navigation. Is it chimerical to believe that much of the waters in the St. Lawrence, now impassable for ships, may be made navigable by dams constructed for the purpose of generating power?

There was pending before the Senate last session a proposition for a private corporation to build and operate such a dam at the Long Sault Rapids in the St. Lawrence, and the provisions in the proposed grant all had in view construction and operation in such a manner as to facilitate open water as well as lock navigation. And so valuable did the concessionaires regard this latent power in the waters that they are willing, not only to build their locks and dams so as to facilitate navigation, but they were willing to pay something per horsepower generated for this concession.

This suggests the probable fact that the power possibilities of the St. Lawrence can be made to pay for improving much of the rivers. I am informed that by proper dam construction practically all of the rapids in the river save one can be overcome in this way, and with little expense to either country.

How much of the improvement of the St. Lawrence can be secured through the development of its water power? Is it not of sufficient importance to empower and instruct the President to investigate and report upon?

The Welland Canal would need to be enlarged, or a new canal dug, and larger locks constructed. But no mechanical prohibitions intervene. Whatever improvements are made in furtherance of this project must and should be made through a joint understanding, if not through the joint operation, of Canada and the United States. The waters lie in both countries. The benefits would inure to both. The binational control of these waters may make it desirable that improvements made in waters lying wholly in United States territory should be made by the United States, and improvements similarly made in Canadian waters should be made by Canada. And if improvements are made by impounding waters, as they should be wherever possible, the benefits from power should inure to the country in whose territory the power site is located.

Improvements in boundary territory should be made by both countries and mutual power benefits should go to both.

The fees from lockages should be apportioned according to location and benefit, but they should be reasonable and uniform. If, however, it shall develop that private power companies will not be found to construct dams, which will contribute materially to the accomplishment of the plan, or, if the total cost to Canada should seem to her prohibitive, I believe an international agreement can be entered into whereby the United States can perform the work without embarrassment to Canada.

I am aware that there are canal projects now pending before the Ottawa Parliament, but none of them is as feasible as the international waterway which is here proposed. If this route lay all in Canada, no one in that country would consider the Georgian Bay-Ottawa River route, or any other, in preference to this one. This is a gigantic enterprise which is proposed, but it is in keeping with the spirit of modern enterprise, and with harmonious action on the part of these two great modern Nations it can be accomplished to the glory and immeasurable benefit of both.

It will cost much money, but its accomplishment will warrant the expenditure. How much it will cost I can hardly approximate, and yet we can find some information on the subject. In 1906, when President Taft was Secretary of War, a survey was made for the purpose of determining the cost of a 25-foot channel of sufficient width from Duluth and Chicago to Buffalo, and the total amount was \$26,000,000, besides several millions to be expended in dredging some of the lake harbors to the 25-foot depth. This survey and estimate included improvement in the St. Marys River and locks costing \$11,000,237; in the passage from Lake Huron to Detroit River, \$2,334,180; in the Detroit River, \$11,571,450; in Grays Reef passage from Lake Michigan into Lake Huron, \$426,500; or, in all, \$25,938,367.

Canada has, as I have stated, expended \$97,000,000 on portions of this waterway. It may cost both United States and Canada, on the distance between Lake Erie and Montreal, \$150,000,000 for a waterway of sufficient depth to accommodate seagoing vessels. This amount may be materially reduced by assistance from power-developing companies. It may cost more than this sum. But Canada is seriously considering a water route from the Lakes to Montreal through Georgian Bay and the Ottawa River; and another by canal from the southern part of Lake Huron across to Lake Erie, and from Lake Erie either through the enlarged Welland Canal or a new one across to Lake Ontario, thence down the St. Lawrence to near Ogdensburg, and from there by canal to the Ottawa River, and then down to the St. Lawrence.

There are too many canals in these schemes; too many obstacles to be overcome, it seems to me, and, besides, the course laid out by nature seems the reasonable one, and I believe it is possible for the two Nations to agree upon some system of improvement which will be mutually satisfactory and beneficial. Anyway, Mr. President, the project is so big with possibilities that it should be given the most serious thought and investigation by the two Nations which are, we hope, entering upon an era of good will and amity.

To me this is a greater proposition than the Panama Canal. It has within it potentialities of great proportions. Had time permitted I could have shown something of the mighty commerce which would be benefited by this deep waterway. Last year more than \$700,000,000 worth of tonnage sailed down the Detroit River. More than 50,000,000 tons of freight passed through the Soo Locks. Much of this immense value and tonnage was destined for foreign trade. Suppose it could have been loaded into ships which would carry it without reloading to its European destination? Can you comprehend the saving to industry, the gain to producers? With such a waterway established, our grain and other agricultural products raised for foreign consumption would not have to pay the tolls of reshipment and excessive railroad rates, and the farmer would get the benefits. The copper and iron manufactured for the foreign trade would be turned out at the furnaces, smelters, and factories erected upon the Great Lakes—an arm of the sea.

Mr. President, this may be a dream, but some day the dream will come true. It may come in the distant future. But it will come. Impatient as its advocates may be for the hour of its consummation, they will not be discouraged. That it looks to the future for the realization of its hopes is no valid objection to any worthy cause.

Canadian reciprocity, with its attendant possibilities, must not be judged entirely by its present achievements, neither by those of the immediate to-morrow. It should be judged by its continent-wide outlook into the future. It is an earnest of that good day when these two nations of the same ancestry, possessed of the same hopes, and striving for the same high ideals, will have recognized the great truth that it is wasteful to industry and detrimental to social and moral progress to wage trade wars and a mistake to refuse or neglect to use those natural advantages which are pregnant with mutual benefits waiting to be delivered by international cooperation.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Michigan takes his seat, I should like to ask him if he has in his studies investigated in any way the route from New York via Lake Champlain and the St. Lawrence River to the West?

Mr. TOWNSEND. In 1896 the Government authorized the Secretary of War to investigate the proposition of a waterway all within the United States, or waters bounding the United States from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River. The route to which the Senator from Vermont refers was one of three routes investigated, and a voluminous report was made in July, 1897. The Army engineers reported adversely on all of the three propositions. It was thought that the expense, \$200,000,000, would be too great, and besides, the particular route to which the Senator refers would include too much canal navigation. I am not quoting literally from that report, but that is the impression I have of it.

Mr. PAGE. But, Mr. President, if the canal to which the Senator has been referring, if the waterway down the St. Lawrence River is ever deepened so as to accommodate seagoing vessels, is it not true that the expense of connecting the St. Lawrence River with Lake Champlain will probably be very slight, and that Lake Champlain and the Hudson River together almost fill the gap between the St. Lawrence and New York City?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I quite agree with the Senator from Vermont that, if this scheme of developing the St. Lawrence River is carried out, the additional plan of connecting the St. Lawrence with Lake Champlain will be easy of accomplishment; and I have no doubt that, in the interest of the great State of New York and of the great East in fact, such a scheme would be completed.

Mr. PAGE. I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Michigan has said with reference to this waterway, but I could not allow the opportunity to pass without suggesting that the project having been completed as he would complete it, so far as expense is concerned, from Lake Champlain to the St. Lawrence River—and he will bear in mind that the Richelieu River is the outlet of Lake Champlain, and passes into the St. Lawrence River—is a very feasible project. It only remains to build from the lower end of Lake Champlain to the Hudson River at Troy or Albany, and that, I suppose, is less than a hundred miles—

Mr. TOWNSEND. And some work has been done on it. The Champlain Canal covers part of the distance.

Mr. PAGE. And there is already a canal there. It seems to me that the tonnage from New York to the West by way of this waterway would approach very nearly that of the foreign traffic to which the Senator has called attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments to the bill to be offered as in Committee of the Whole?

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. NELSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with Canada, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments to be offered to the bill as in Committee of the Whole? If not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to read the title of the bill, and was interrupted by,

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. Out of order, I ask leave to offer an amendment which I intend to propose to the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie upon the table.

If there are no further amendments to be offered to the pending bill as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The Secretary read the title of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to occupy unnecessarily the time of the Senate in regard to this measure, but before it shall finally be voted upon I desire to submit a few remarks.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to his colleague?

Mr. HEYBURN. I merely ask for information: Is the bill in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has been reported to the Senate, and it is now in the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. When was it reported to the Senate, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A very few moments ago. It was the last business that was done.

Mr. NELSON. I was not aware of that. The bill was called up and the action was rather sudden. I do not think that is right.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I am certain that there was not one Senator in five who had the slightest idea that such action had been taken with this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated the question distinctly; and after the Chair had made the statement, he waited. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] asked recognition from the Chair. It was then granted. After the Senator from Minnesota had offered his amendment, the Chair again stated the question, and no Senator then spoke. The Secretary reported the bill to the Senate, and the Chair then announced that the bill was in the Senate, whereupon the Chair recognized the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I think there is no criticism of the Chair, but I think it was not the desire of the Senate that the bill should leave the Committee of the Whole; and, if it is in order, I ask that the bill be recommitted to the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the bill be returned to the Senate as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I move that the bill be returned to the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas moves that the bill be returned to the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania, in charge of the bill, to consent to that. I am quite sure Senators did not understand the matter. They were inattentive. It was not the fault of the Chair, but the fault of the Senate. I am sure very few understood what was going on at the moment, and I hardly think, as a friend of the bill, that substantial progress can be made by that course, although I leave it to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has had great experience.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to echo the utterance of the Senator from Missouri. I do not think it is consistent with the usages of the Senate to insist upon anything which has been done through inadvertence. I quite agree to the fact that there is no possible criticism upon the Chair. The facts are exactly, and the announcements were made exactly, as stated by the Chair, and I so understood them at the time they were made; but I was none the less conscious of the fact that the Senate at large did not know that the announcement was being made. There is a universal practice in the Senate, whenever anything has been done by inadvertence, that it should not be insisted upon; and, as a friend of the bill, I also join in the request of the Senator from Missouri to the Senator from Pennsylvania to consent that the request be acceded to upon the ground that it was not the deliberate act of the Senate and not the intention of the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not want to take any unfair advantage of the Senate or of any individual Senator in the consideration of this bill, but it seems to me that a little fair treatment toward this measure is justly to be expected. The Senate this morning refused to fix a date for a vote, and now, apparently, no one is willing to proceed with a discussion of the measure. This will not be the only time that Senators will be caught napping if they are not prepared to go on with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. We do not want to catch anybody napping in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think anybody was caught napping.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not mean to say, from my point of view, that anybody was caught napping, but the allegation of Senators who wish this action reconsidered is that they were caught in a condition when they were not giving careful attention to legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is mistaken. I did not say that.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I misapprehended the position of the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. I said, evidently the Senate did not desire that the bill should be reported from the Committee of the Whole to the Senate; and I think that will be made manifest if a roll call on my motion is rendered necessary.

Mr. PENROSE. The question was put deliberately by the Chair, and it was very evident that none of the Senators interested in opposing this measure were giving sufficient attention to the proceedings of the Senate to know what was going on or what would be done. I am perfectly willing to withdraw my objection and let the bill go back to the Committee of the Whole, but I hope that the Senate will show some appreciation of the course and proceed with the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania withdraws his objection. If there be no further objection, the bill will be considered as again in Committee of the Whole. No other objection is heard. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is recognized.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as the basis of some remarks I expect to make later upon this bill, I desire to put into the Record something in the nature of historic facts with reference to reciprocity and the position of the party of which I am a humble member upon this important subject.

My early training and environment lead me to desire to talk to a text, and I read as a text to-day the following:

The western farmer's instinct is wiser than Mr. Gladstone's philosophy. The farmer knows that the larger the home market the better his prices, and that as his home market is narrowed his prices fall.

Everyone will recognize that this is a statement made by Mr. Blaine in his famous controversy with Mr. Gladstone upon the question of protection or free trade. No one in his day ever doubted the ability of Mr. Blaine to deal with this subject. He was a profound student, a brave and fearless defender of his faith at all times and against all comers. Along the same line, I call attention to a statement made by the late Speaker Reed:

If we propose to abandon any industries, we had better not let it be the agricultural industries. Between the Atlantic and Pacific stretch vast regions still untitled. The next victory of protection should be there.

Our system of protection is not for manufacturers alone. It is for farmers also. Whoever deprives our farmers of all the American market they can occupy is false to his principles and must meet with defeat, or the system must be surrendered which proclaims that American markets are first of all for American citizens, who are engaged in developing the country we already have.

No one will question an authority so high upon the subject under discussion. Mr. Reed, had he been permitted to speak upon this occasion, could not have spoken more trenchantly and effectively than he did in almost the last utterance which he made upon the subject of protection. The leader of his party in his day, an intellectual giant, need I go further in justification of my position as a Republican in the unpleasant duty of opposing this measure? I call attention particularly to this sentence:

Between the Atlantic and Pacific stretch vast regions still untitled.

There is to-day, according to the statistics furnished us by the Bureau of Statistics, one-half of the agricultural lands of the United States in private ownership that are not under cultivation. There are outside of the lands which are in private ownership easily 75,000,000 acres of public lands that are as well fitted for agricultural purposes as those which are now under cultivation. In other words, there are millions of acres of land well fitted to produce and with proper encouragement would be reduced to cultivation and which it would seem it would be the part of wisdom upon the part of the American people to encourage to be placed under cultivation. Why deal with the foreigner with millions of untitled acres at home, which, if tilled, would not only bring more products to the market, but more taxes to the Treasury and thus lessen the burdens of all?

I read also a statement from another source—politically speaking:

In the year 1832, when the question was under consideration in the Senate, Mr. Benton, speaking on Mr. Clay's tariff resolution, called attention to the fact that our domestic manufacturers, having a high tariff on their fabrics, were producing many from raw material from foreign countries, and showed that our flax fabrics were from foreign flax, and he cited wool, hemp, indigo, hides, and furs, of which five articles we had imported in six years \$25,000,000. Commenting on the fact, he observed:

"This immense sum has been paid to foreigners instead of to American citizens."

Among other things he said:

"The farmers and planters of the United States should be admitted into the benefits of the American system and secured in the domestic supply of the raw material to our manufacturers. I hope for this much for the farmers and for the honor of the system, for nothing can be more absurd than to erect domestic manufactures upon foreign (raw) material; nothing more contradictory than to predicate independence for goods upon dependence for materials to make them of; nothing more iniquitous than to give to the manufacturers the home market of goods and not to give the farmers the home market of raw materials."

Mr. Jackson, in one of his messages to Congress, used this language:

The agricultural interest is so essentially connected with every other and so superior in importance to them all that it is scarcely necessary to invite to it your particular attention. It is principally as manufactures and commerce tend to increase the value of agricultural products and to extend their application to the wants and comforts of society that they deserve the fostering care of government.

These quotations from the opposition party will serve also to remind how far both parties are wandering from the whole-some political principles of other days, days when men realized that the first care and duty of the statesman and the patriot was to look well to the producing classes—the laborer, the miner, the farmer.

These excerpts from distinguished leaders of those times are quoted with a view of making them applicable later in the discussion.

We had a treaty with Canada in 1854. It remained in force until about 1865. It was very similar to the treaty now under consideration. In some respects it was better. But it was similar in that it dealt alone with natural products of the farm, similar in that it opened our markets to the agriculturist of the Dominion.

This treaty was unsatisfactory from the day it was signed until it was repealed. It proved to be greatly to the detriment of the American farmer and American interests, and very greatly to the advantage of the Canadian interests and the Canadian farmers. In this connection, I call attention to an editorial from the New York Tribune, under date of December 15, 1864, and about the time that this treaty was being abrogated, written by Mr. Greeley, wherein he says, among other things:

The treaty was a swindle from top to bottom, such as would be a reciprocal contract to exchange coals between Newcastle and Paris—it gave Canada the free use of our markets in which to sell her enormous agricultural products. * * * It gave Canada the use of our markets and short highways to the Atlantic for literally nothing. * * * The treaty was a contrivance to build up an enormous empire on our flank by the untaxed use of our high-priced markets.

The editorial is an extensive one, and well worth study and consideration.

I also call attention to a leading editorial from the Chicago Tribune, under date of December 21, 1864, at the time that this treaty was under discussion for abrogation. After calling attention to some matters which had been advanced as an argument in favor of continuing the treaty, the editorial continues:

On the other hand, the treaty enables Canada to compete with our own people in the lumber trade to the great disadvantage of our north-western lumber districts, and in the coarse grains—oats, barley, etc.—it enables Canada to compete with our western farmers and dealers in the eastern markets. Thus much for our export trade. Our import trade, under the treaty, is inconsiderable. The whole amount of merchandise received at the port of Chicago under the treaty in 1862 was but \$45,763, of which \$16,640 was brought in foreign vessels. In 1863 the trade was \$58,238, of which \$27,877 was brought in foreign vessels.

When we enlarge our inquiry into the effects of this treaty to the whole country, it is undeniable that in some respects it is very far from being reciprocal, and that it has vastly benefited Canada at the expense of the United States. The Canadian statesman and the Canadian press freely admit that it has so built up the Canadian people as to put an end to the former disposition of many of them for annexation, and as one of the members of Parliament, Hon. Isaac Buchanan, expresses it, "Has left the Canadian farmer nothing to envy in the condition of the American farmer." He further says, "And but for the most obvious providences, among which is the obtaining our reciprocity treaty with the United States, the disruption of the empire would have been endangered before now." The inference is that a repeal of the treaty would induce a return to their former feeling of dependence upon us and desire for annexation. We might cite the whole Canadian press in proof of the fact that the treaty has built up Canada, but we prefer the dryer, more incontrovertible statistics which prove that the profits which result from the treaty are all on the Canadian side, like the tracks before the lion's den, all going in, none coming out.

I call attention here to the fact that this is from a paper which was then friendly to reciprocity, and which, I understand, is still friendly to reciprocity, but it has more company now than it had then.

In the four years from 1850 to 1853, inclusive, the importations free of duty from Canada to the United States were \$4,107,392, while the importations paying duty were \$15,200,634, or nearly four times greater. But the importations free of duty after the treaty took effect in four years from 1856 to 1859, inclusive, were \$59,419,925, and those subject to duty had fallen off in the same time to \$2,150,394, or only 1 in 28.

Now, while the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Root] was greatly exhilarated over the proposition of the friendlier relations which would arise between Canada and the United States and the augmenting of the trade between those two countries, if we are to judge the future in the light of past experience we shall find that Canada, as every other nation, will seek at all times to build up itself and will take advantage of the reciprocity agreement to aggrandize and accentuate its differences rather than to curtail them in accordance with the spirit of reciprocity.

This is not reciprocity, but a clear gain to the Canadas. In 1858, when the United States collected duties only on \$313,953 in value of Canadian productions, those of American labor upon which duties were paid in Canada amounted to \$4,524,503. During 1856-1857-1858 the amount of American industry taxed in Canada was \$18,294,293, more than that of Canadian production taxed in this country. Their trade has almost ceased to be a source of revenue to us, while from our trade they draw their custom contributions.

In 1856 we imported from Canada free \$17,810,684 in merchandise. Had it been subject to the usual revenue it would have paid us some four millions. In the first four years after the treaty came into operation we received of the list of articles named in the treaty \$28,771,691 in value more than Canada received from us, paying for them, of course, in gold, exchange, or duty-paying products. These figures all go to show that the treaty makes Canada the seller and we the buyer, while what we have to sell she does not buy. This causes a drain of coin, of which we paid them in 1862 \$2,530,000, and in 1863 \$3,502,180. Indeed, it is estimated that in gold or its equivalent we export, as the effects of the treaty, \$10,000,000 annually to pay for agricultural production, all of which the Northwest can far more profitably supply.

It will be remembered that the treaty refers to raw material and natural products alone, the very articles for which Canada and the Western States need a market, while manufactured goods, which might restore the balance if allowed to be exported from the Eastern States, are not covered by the treaty. On the contrary, since the treaty was passed, the Canadians have shut these out by levying ad valorem duties on all imports which, so long as English manufacturers can produce an article at less cost than the American, excludes the latter. These and similar arguments are having their effect in the mind of the majority of the people of this country. It is argued that while there is a possible gain to one or two agricultural interests, yet on the whole the farmers of Canada are being enriched at the expense of our own. We feel that as in and by this treaty we have given Canada her recent prosperity, so, by the right of rescinding it, we hold that prosperity still in our hands. When in return for the advantage we have thus conferred we find that substantial benefits are not even repaid with common good will, but to the very independence to which we have contributed is displayed in siding with our national enemies, it is not at all remarkable that even among the friends of the reciprocity treaty many are inquiring closely into the relative profits of the bargain we have made, or are disinterested, and on purely national grounds demanding that, whether profitable to some of us or not, it must be terminated.

This is an editorial, written, it seems to me, dispassionately, at a time when the actual experience was with us and based upon facts and figures which are elsewhere sustained and verified.

We have throughout the great western country and the great Northwest the capacity to do what Canada is now invited to do, and that is to supply the home market with the natural products. The simple question is, Shall we be turned aside after building up the eastern market for a foreigner? Mr. President, if there is one cardinal principle in the protective system more permanent and distinctive than all others it is that the American market place belongs to the American producer so long as he is able to supply that market. With one-half of the agricultural lands in the United States untitled, with millions of acres of public lands yet to be cultivated, what reason is there for American statesmanship to turn from the encouragement of the American farmer to produce and fill the American market place, to barter and trade with the foreign producer? Why turn the settler's face toward Canada instead of the unsettled lands of our own?

It is an acknowledged fact that within the last 8 or 10 years the prices upon the American farm have been augmented to such an extent as to bring about, if not a return of those who have left, a retardation of the movement from the farm to the city, and hundreds and thousands of acres of lands which had been abandoned from 1870 to 1890 have been reclaimed in these different States and are to-day entering upon an era of cultivation and production.

There is one of the great States in this Union, which I might mention if necessary, that in 1900 had 20,000 farms advertised for sale, and farms in one of the great rich valleys of the State which had sold for \$150 an acre were selling for \$20 and \$30 and \$40 an acre.

It is a fact, evidenced by statistics which no one, I apprehend, will controvert, that within the last five years hundreds and thousands of acres of those abandoned farms have gone back under cultivation, and the price which was reduced from \$30 to \$40 has been increased from \$75 to \$80 and \$100 an acre.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to ask if the Senator from Idaho insists that the occupation of those farms came through the process of the tariff? Were not those farms occupied in spite of the tariff? The fact is, sir, that the multiplied immigration has occupied those farms, and the zenith has not yet been reached. Thousands of farms are still vacant to-day throughout the State of Connecticut and many other portions of our Union.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BORAH. I yield, but I should like to answer the Senator from New Jersey, because he asked me a question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think you ought to answer him.

Mr. BORAH. I think that of course the farm would be occupied regardless of the tariff. But there can be no doubt, I presume, that the extent of the occupancy and the extent of agriculture will be somewhat controlled by the price which the farmer realizes for his products.

It is quite true, as was said so well by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] the other day, that a tariff will not close up a farm in the sense that it will close up a manufacturing establishment, because the farm is a home. The farmer must fight not only for material success, but he must fight for his home. But it makes the condition severer and harder for men to stay there, and gradually they work themselves away from the farm into the city, where they can secure a competency.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. What—

Mr. BORAH. I know that my friend, the Senator from New Jersey, is a farmer, but he is not our kind of a farmer. He has been speaking here in the interest of the American farmer and as a farmer for some days. I could not believe that the distinguished-looking gentleman, with his gold spectacles and his Hyperion curl, was indeed a farmer, so I began to investigate. I found that my friend about 18 or 20 years ago had a farm of 160 acres down in his State of New Jersey, and that he farmed it for awhile and played politics some. About 10 or 15 years afterwards a great manufacturing town, built up by manufacturing, grew to his farm, and he cut up his farm into little lots and built 75 or 100 houses upon them, and sold or rented the houses and lots and came to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to say to the Senate that the diagnosis of the Senator from Idaho is fairly correct. I want to say further that I have lived on a farm all my life, and until the past three years I have been an active farmer and could cradle a field of rye equal to any other gentleman in this body. Further, in answer to the charge of the distinguished Senator that I built houses, I say yes; and I built them with unprotected American labor. My laborers were in competition with the open markets of the world, competing with the pauper labor that you protectionists have been telling us so much of. And let me say that while I built about 75 houses, when I had built about 5 houses I found had it not been for the iniquitous and accursed system of this intolerable tariff I could have built 3 more houses with the same money. Take the tariff off of the hardware and the glass and the other things that enter into house construction and I could have built 5 where I built 3.

I will say to you that my carpenters were paid under the nonprotective system, open to the pauper markets of the world, \$3.50 per day; my masons were paid \$4.50 per day; my hod carriers, \$2.50; and my painters, \$3.50.

Now let me ask, since the distinguished Senator has opened up this question—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Let me ask the Senator—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho further yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. As the Senator has opened up this question—

The VICE PRESIDENT. One moment, until the Chair ascertains whether the Senator from Idaho will further yield. He has indicated that he did not desire to yield further. Does the Senator from Idaho further yield?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. My friend—

Mr. BORAH. I dislike not to yield, but I should like for the Senator to confine himself to a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The distinguished Senator has opened the door. I want to show you, my distinguished friend from Idaho, the contrary side of the protected industry. My laborers receive \$3.50, \$4, and \$5 per day in the open markets of the world. In mills 8 miles from my home—in factories, mills, and workshops protected to the zenith under the process of the hateful tariff—I find American white women and girls working in woolen mills and factories under the munificent tariff system for 85 cents and 90 cents a day.

Turn 12 miles in the other direction to Paterson and Passaic and see the miserable, measly pittance that white women under the protective system get, until women get scarcely money enough to hold body and soul together. Ah, God knows

you are welcome to the glories of the protective system that has made paupers on one side and millionaires beyond the dream of avarice on the other.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, suffice it to say that I am still here. I have great sympathy with the kind of farmers the Senator from New Jersey represents—a man seventy-five times a landlord and perhaps many times a millionaire—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; I plead not guilty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey will address the Chair.

Mr. BORAH. I can understand precisely how it is that at least one farmer got into the American Senate. But, Mr. President, it is evident from the statement of the Senator from New Jersey that under this iniquitous tariff system he has prospered well. No one can certainly complain of the success which he has had. New Jersey, of all the States in the Union, has received most benefit from the protective tariff system. That is the reason, Mr. President, why a farmer in the well-protected State of New Jersey can come in here as a Senator, many times a landlord, while the farmers in other parts of the country not so well protected, farther from the market, must be content with what feeble representation they have.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say—

The VICE PRESIDENT. One moment, until the Senator from Idaho indicates that he will yield. Does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield for a question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to answer. When the Senator says that I am a hundred times a millionaire, I tell you I plead not guilty; but I want—

Mr. BORAH. I was judging from his appearance only. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. My appearance deceived you. If you want to get the truth, you can turn my pockets inside out. I want to say, in answer to the distinguished Senator, I am proud of the fact that I am the first Senator from the little Commonwealth of New Jersey who was elected by the vote of the people, and not a son marqué was expended in my political campaign.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was rather a small vote.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Never mind; I got all the votes that were there for me.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was a very small proportion.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I did not desire to call in question the election of the Senator. I am glad that he is here, the Senate would be a dull place without my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. President, I want to call attention now to some further facts with reference to the treaty of 1854 to 1865. I have said that the Canadian reciprocity agreement of 1854 to 1865 was unsatisfactory; that it proved to be beneficial to Canada and greatly to the detriment of the United States.

I want to read a few extracts from a report made to the Secretary of the Treasury in 1860, by Hon. Israel T. Hatch, after a pretty thorough investigation.

I know, Mr. President, that these things will seem dull and uninteresting, but they are the things which tell the effect of such a measure as we are now proposing to enact, and they represent the actual workings of that which in theory is supposed to be quite different.

Familiar as the public mind must have been made with the principles which finally produced this treaty by these and similar almost authoritative expressions of opinion, brought home at intervals as these ideas must have been to the legislation and diplomacy of the country, it is not surprising that this practical but limited experiment in substantial free trade was attempted. The leading idea of the treaty itself was to permit the introduction of the products of one country into the other free of duty, and consequent reciprocal benefits were expected to follow to both. The various colonies included in its provisions were left to regulate their own tariffs, and each colonial power can annul its honorary obligations without reference to its sister Provinces or the engagements of the Empire. No statesmanship could, however, fortell the workings of the treaty or had a right to anticipate legislation adverse to its spirit. Correct in principle as the treaty itself was, the perversion of its spirit and the disregard of its substance on the part of Canada have produced results it is the province of this report to exhibit.

The conduct of the Canadian Government is not brought forward for the purpose of criticizing, but for the purpose of explaining that which we may anticipate will happen again; that the Canadian Government, using the reciprocity agreement as a basis, will serve its individual and selfish purposes as best it may; and this delightful and inspiring doctrine of the brotherhood of man and sisterhood of woman will have very little to do when Canada comes to apply the proposition of building up her great industries. We will still be in severe competition with the great nation upon the north, and whatever advantage is given to that nation by reason of the reciprocity agreement

will be taken and utilized to aggrandize its forces and its ability to grow rather than an incentive to return a reciprocal favor to the United States.

I call attention to a table found upon page 12 of this report, which explains itself:

INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF FREE GOODS IMPORTED FROM CANADA.

The market change in the amount of free goods imported from Canada into the United States since the treaty is shown in the following table, exhibiting also in contrast the importations from the same Province, and subject to duty, from June 30, 1850, to July 1, 1859:

Importations to the United States from Canada.

Years.	Free of duty.	Subject to duty.
1850.....	\$636,454	\$3,649,016
1851.....	1,529,085	3,420,786
1852.....	761,571	3,828,398
1853.....	1,179,682	4,098,434
1854.....	380,041	6,341,498
1855.....	6,876,496	5,305,818
1856.....	16,847,822	640,375
1857.....	17,600,737	691,097
1858.....	11,267,618	313,953
1859.....	13,703,748	504,969
Total.....	70,733,854	28,800,344

I quote further from the report:

The treaty was conceived in the theories of free trade and in harmony with the progress and civilization of the age. It was a step forward in political science. American legislation had been characterized by an extraordinary liberality to a foreign neighbor, placing her lines of transportation upon an equality with our own and her merchants upon an equality with our own in receiving foreign merchandise in bond. We conceded commercial freedom upon all their products of agriculture, the forest, and the mine, and they have either closed their markets against the chief products that we could sell to them or exacted a large duty on admission into their markets.

YEARLY CHANGES AND INCREASED DUTIES IN CANADIAN TARIFFS.

From time to time Canadian duties have been increased since the ratification of the treaty, and during the last five years the following duties have been exacted on the declared value of various chief articles of consumption:

Articles.	1855	1856	1857	1858	1859
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Molasses.....	16	11	11	18	30
Sugar, refined.....	32	28	25	26½	40
Sugar, other.....	27½	20	17½	21	30
Boots and shoes.....	12½	14½	20	21	25
Harness.....	12½	17	20	21	25
Cotton goods.....	12½	13½	15	15	20
Iron goods.....	12½	18½	15	16	20
Silk goods.....	12½	13½	15	17	20
Wool goods.....	12½	14	15	18	20

Every year a new tariff has been enacted, and each of them has inflicted higher duties upon the chief productions of American labor. These duties are so adjusted as to fall most heavily upon the products of our citizens.

TARIFF TO EXCLUDE THE MANUFACTURES AND COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES.

The tariff of 1859 was avowedly based upon an isolating and exclusive policy. It was supported on this ground alike by ministerial organs of the press, by petitions in its favor, and by members of the colonial Parliament. After securing our free market for all Canadian productions, its advocates argued that it was the interest of Canadians to become independent of all other countries, and to employ their own ships and their own people, thus "keeping in the country all that is now paid to the United States."

I also call attention to some of the language used in debate upon the abrogation of this treaty.

Mr. Pike, in the House, said:

I confess I am impatient of delay. I desire this treaty to draw its last breath as soon as possible. Had it much longer to live in order to die a natural death, if that be not paradoxical, I should be disposed to use violence and destroy a life which, in my judgment, has been productive of so much injury. It was a creature of mistaken views and of expectations which had no basis in fact. Its workings have been a continuous and protracted disappointment. It has achieved no considerable result which was predicted for it, and I ask the attention of the House for a short time while I exhibit its utter failure in all particulars which should render a commercial arrangement with a foreign country desirable to us.

I can tell him who did make the treaty. It was the Canadian Government, and Canadian money circulating freely here in Washington, lubricating the official channels through which the treaty and accompanying laws had to pass. It may be that the eastern manufacturers assisted them. If so, they got badly cheated, as the diminished exports of manufactures plainly prove.

I know the manufacturers had large expectations from the treaty. They reckoned upon getting raw material cheaper from the Provinces. They thought they could support their operatives at less expense with the potatoes, wood, and lumber of the Provinces than if they were obliged to obtain those articles from Maine; and while doing this they reckoned upon adding largely to their sales. But in this they were mistaken. They lost more in the falling off of customers than they gained by cheapening what they bought. The fact that after the treaty went into operation our exports to the Provinces fell off settled this

conclusively. Instead of an increase of export of manufactures which should correspond with the increase of imports and the large increase of population on both sides of the line, the export of manufactures fell off largely. I do not propose to go into detail of this. Two years since I had the honor to present to the House resolutions adopted by the legislature of my State condemnatory of this treaty, and I took occasion at that time to give the statistics connected with the whole trade with the Provinces, and particularly the export of manufactures since the date of the treaty.

In his letter sent in here a few days since I find a table giving the values of certain manufactures exported to Canada for five years, from 1858-59 to 1862-63. The results as given are instructive. The years end July 1 in each year:

1859	-----	\$4,185,516
1860	-----	3,548,114
1861	-----	3,501,642
1862	-----	2,596,930
1863	-----	1,510,802

I commend the table to manufacturers.

It was supposed that as this looked toward free trade, commerce would be largely benefited. Shipbuilders and shipowners were, for that reason, in favor of the treaty. But it was of no manner of benefit to the shipowners. The whole increase of provincial trade comes to us in provincial bottoms. I know that in my own State, in a profitable little eddy of provincial trade, there are those willing to foster the treaty at the expense of the whole country, and they talk of this treaty as benefiting commerce.

I now call the attention of the House to a serious loss of revenue which the Government sustains every day during the continuance of the treaty. It can not be estimated at less than \$10,000,000 per annum.

When the treaty went into operation we were collecting about \$1,300,000 of duties on imports from the Provinces. Since then we have not received enough to pay the salaries of officials along the lines. We should restore these duties, and, following the Canadian example, add to them largely.

The import from the Provinces is over twenty millions annually, and could well bear a taxation of \$3,000,000 by means of a tariff which would have the effect to throw a portion of its own burdens upon the foreign producer.

John Sherman, in the Senate, used this language:

When the reciprocity treaty was adopted in 1855, there was then a state of things existing along the border which induced both parties to cultivate kindly relations and the exchange of commodities between them. I have no doubt that Great Britain got a great deal the best of the bargain, especially in the schedule of articles named which should be exchanged free of duty. The treaty has operated from the beginning against our interests; and it can be plainly demonstrated by the tables which are furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury that from the beginning our trade has fallen off and theirs increased, comparatively.

I think even a cursory examination of the workings of a similar treaty from 1854 to 1865 will justify every opposition which has been made to this measure. It built up the Canadian agricultural interests and the Canadian farmer to the detriment of the American farmer. On the other hand, it did not compensate the United States for this loss to the American farmer in any manner whatever. The American manufacturer soon learned that he lost more in his sales to the American farmer, who was injured and unable to buy, than he gained in his sales to the Canadian farmer.

Mr. President, since the abrogation of the Canadian treaty in 1865 we have many times been approached by that country for similar agreements, but always for a reciprocal trade in farm or natural products alone. So far as I am advised, there has never been any effort upon the part of the Canadian Government to secure any other kind of a reciprocal trade agreement.

Premier Laurier said, in the first interview made after this agreement was proposed:

The Dominion Government may find it possible to have some measure of reciprocal trade with her southern neighbor to the benefit of the farmer who asks for it without injuring the manufacturers who oppose it.

I did not suppose at the time I first read that interview he would be able to accomplish what he desired to accomplish. I have since changed my opinion. In a later interview, Mr. Laurier says:

Our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting this agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements. Although it was part of our policy to obtain reciprocity with the United States, we have acted carefully in so doing, and have not injured any industry.

In other words, it is the view of the premier, perhaps the ablest diplomat upon the American Continent, that without injuring any industry in Canada, without in any way materially injuring the growth of that country in its industrial development, they have, nevertheless, opened the market of 90,000,000 people to the great farming interests in Canada. They have accomplished precisely what they designed to accomplish. I wait now with some degree of interest to have any friend of this measure inform me what it was that we received from Canada in consideration of turning the American market place over to the Canadian producer. What benefit does this agreement give us? Wherein has Canada traded us any reciprocal thing for that which we have given to Canada in the nature of our farm products? Give me one definite, concrete proposition. Do not lead me away into sophomoric effusions

about one language, one blood, and the brotherhood of man, but in this cold business deal, which Canada drove home with so much business selfishness, tell me what we got out of it. What we got, sir, was a deal between the Canadian farmer and our eastern manufacturer, to give the eastern manufacturer cheaper raw material—a clear, cold-blooded discrimination against the American farmer.

Although Canada, as I have said, has been knocking at our door from 1865 until now for the purpose of securing this kind of an agreement, never until this agreement was submitted has the party of which I am an humble member for a single moment entertained the proposition. On the other hand, it has repeatedly denounced it.

Not only that, Mr. President, but in every campaign which the Republican Party has made from 1864 until now we have pledged our honor to the American farmer that no such deal would be made. If there is anyone who can point me to a line, to a letter, to a declaration upon the part of any Republican leader, in any platform, in any declaration of anyone having authority to speak for the Republican Party, in support of this kind of an agreement in the party organization or by the organization, he will be able to find what industry upon my part has been unable to find.

Listen to what Mr. Blaine said to Mr. Harrison. In 1891 Mr. Blaine wrote to President Harrison as follows:

It is of the highest possible importance, in my view, that there be no treaty of reciprocity with Canada. They aim at natural products, to get all the products of the farm on us in exchange for heaven knows what. It would be considered a betrayal of the agricultural interests. The fact is, we do not want any intercourse with Canada except through the medium of a tariff.

It will be noticed, Mr. President, when those who speak of this measure as a betrayal of our agricultural interests that they are using language long ago justified by our greatest leaders, language which has been shouted from every Republican platform in the United States.

In 1891 the distinguished leader of the Republican organization, in his letter to Mr. Harrison, said they desire our market place in return for heaven knows what, and that any such arrangement would be considered as what? As a betrayal of the American farmer. We have never as a party in any platform repudiated his severe condemnation.

During the consideration of the Wilson bill the subject of freer trade relations with Canada was a matter of much discussion, and one of the attacks which the Republican leaders, including the distinguished gentleman who now presides over the Senate, made upon that bill was because it attempted to do what we are attempting to do to-day, to make a free list which should prevail and obtain between Canada and the United States. It was not only denounced by every single Republican leader having to do with the formation and discussion of that bill, but we went into the campaign following the enactment of that measure and went into the agricultural States and pledged the American farmer that upon its return to power the Republican Party would repeal that law, and upon that solemn pledge made to the farmers of this country the Republican Party was returned to power. Never was a clearer pledge made to voters and never were voters more loyal to party.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 28, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27, 1911.

ASSISTANT AGENT OF SALMON FISHERIES.

Harry C. Fassett, of California, to be assistant agent, Alaska salmon fisheries, Division of Alaska Fisheries, in the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce and Labor.

WARDEN.

Harry J. Christoffers, of Wisconsin, to be warden, Alaska service, Division of Alaska Fisheries, in the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce and Labor.

DEPUTY WARDENS.

Claude J. Roach, of Michigan, to be deputy warden, Alaska service, Division of Alaska Fisheries, in the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce and Labor.

G. Dallas Hanna, of Kansas, to be deputy warden, Alaska service, Division of Alaska Fisheries, in the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce and Labor.

Lee R. Dice, of Washington, to be deputy warden, Alaska service, Division of Alaska Fisheries, in the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce and Labor.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. John Given Berry to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States (to rank as such from Aug. 3, 1910), to fill the vacancy created June 16, 1911, by the appointment of Capt. Ellsworth Price Bertholf to be captain commandant in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF CHARITIES.

George E. Hamilton, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1911. (Reappointment.)

Myer Cohen, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1911. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

The following-named cadets, graduates of the United States Military Academy, to be second lieutenants with rank from June 13, 1911:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Cadet Philip Bracken Fleming.
Cadet John Wesley Stewart.
Cadet Joseph Cowles Mehaffey.
Cadet Paul Sorg Reinecke.
Cadet Raymond Albert Wheeler.

CAVALRY ARM.

Cadet William Benjamin Hardigg.
Cadet John Everard Hatch.
Cadet Alexander Day Sures.
Cadet Philip James Kieffer.
Cadet Karl Slaughter Bradford.
Cadet Frederick Gilbreath.
Cadet Harrison Henry Cocke Richards.
Cadet Arthur Bayard Conard.
Cadet Frank Hall Hicks.
Cadet John Porter Lucas.
Cadet Wilfrid Mason Blunt.
Cadet James Craig Riddle Schwenck.
Cadet William Patrick Joseph O'Neill.
Cadet Frank Lazelle Van Horn.
Cadet Howell Marion Estes.
Cadet John Furman Wall.
Cadet Leo Gerald Heffernan.
Cadet Edwin Noel Hardy.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Cadet Curtis Hoppin Nance.
Cadet Freeman Wate Bowley.
Cadet John C. Beatty.
Cadet Charles Anderson Walker, jr.
Cadet Bethel Wood Simpson.
Cadet Neil Graham Finch.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Cadet Charles Adam Schimelfenig.
Cadet Charles Reuben Baxter.
Cadet Gustav Henry Franke.
Cadet Hubert Gregory Stanton.
Cadet Harold Floyd Nichols.
Cadet Franklin Kemble.
Cadet Herbert Arthur Dargue.
Cadet John Griffith Booton.
Cadet James Blanchard Crawford.
Cadet Robert W. Clark, jr.
Cadet Robert Lincoln Gray.
Cadet John Louis Homer.
Cadet Robert Clyde Gildart.
Cadet Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian.
Cadet George Derby Holland.
Cadet Joseph William McNeal.
Cadet Max Stanley Murray.

INFANTRY ARM.

Cadet Harry Russell Kutz.
Cadet Thompson Lawrence.
Cadet Harry James Keeley.
Cadet Charles Philip Hall.
Cadet William Edmund Larned.
Cadet Alfred John Betcher.
Cadet Charles Laurence Byrne.
Cadet George Richmond Hicks.
Cadet Haig Shekerjian.
Cadet Charles Sea Floyd.
Cadet Benjamin Curtis Lockwood, jr.
Cadet Carroll Armstrong Bagby.
Cadet Oliver Stelling McCleary.
Cadet Frederick Gilbert Dillman.

Cadet Gregory Hoisington.
Cadet Ziba Lloyd Drollinger.
Cadet Frank Butner Clay.
Cadet Jesse Amos Ladd.
Cadet Paul William Baade.
Cadet Joseph Laura Wier.
Cadet James Roy Newman Weaver.
Cadet James Daniel Burt.
Cadet Emanuel Villard Heidt.
Cadet William Henry Harrison Morris, jr.
Cadet Sidney Herbert Foster.
Cadet Carl Fish McKinney.
Cadet Roscoe Conkling Batson.
Cadet Allen Russell Kimball.
Cadet Ira Adelbert Rader.
Cadet Alvan Crosby Sandeford.
Cadet William Jay Calvert.
Cadet William Burrus McLaurin.
Cadet Kenneth Ebbecke Kern.
Cadet David Hamilton Cowles.
Cadet Ira Thomas Wyche.
Cadet Arthur Clyde Evans.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Marbury Johnston to be a captain in the Navy from the 14th day of June, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James S. Woods to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Asst. Paymaster Frank T. Foxwell to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 26th day of February, 1911 to fill a vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Capt. Reuben B. Miller, Medical Corps, to be major from June 21, 1911, vice Maj. John H. Stone, retired from active service June 20, 1911.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

First Lieut. Nelson E. Margetts, First Field Artillery, to be captain from May 26, 1911, vice Capt. Adrian S. Fleming, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert Davis, Second Field Artillery, to be captain from June 7, 1911, vice Capt. William N. Michel, unassigned, detailed in the Signal Corps on that date.

Second Lieut. Joseph W. Rumbough, Sixth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from June 7, 1911, vice First Lieut. Robert Davis, Second Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. William McCleave, Fourth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from June 13, 1911, vice First Lieut. Dawson Ohmstead, Fifth Field Artillery, detailed in the Signal Corps on that date.

Second Lieut. Allan C. McBride, Fourth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from June 20, 1911, vice First Lieut. Thomas J. Smith, jr., Fourth Field Artillery, detailed in the Ordnance Department on that date.

Second Lieut. Joe R. Brabson, Third Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from June 20, 1911, vice First Lieut. Roger S. Parrott, Second Field Artillery, detailed in the Ordnance Department on that date.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Frank B. Jones, infantry, unassigned, to be colonel from June 21, 1911, vice Col. Walter S. Scott, Fifteenth Infantry, retired from active service June 20, 1911.

Maj. James A. Goodin, Seventh Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from June 21, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Francis J. Kernan, First Infantry, detailed as adjutant general on that date.

Capt. Charles Miller, Third Infantry, to be major from June 21, 1911, vice Maj. James A. Goodin, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 23, 1904, the officer herein named to be placed on the retired list of the Army.

First Lieut. John S. Marshall, United States Army, retired with the rank of captain from June 17, 1911.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

Philip J. Hickey, jr., to be postmaster at Seward, Alaska, in place of Lillie N. Gordon, resigned.

Richard McCormick to be postmaster at Douglas, Alaska, in place of Robert B. Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1910.

KANSAS.

T. J. Robinson to be postmaster at Severy, Kans., in place of George E. Grimes, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Hans N. Smith to be postmaster at South Windham, Mass., in place of John C. Nichols, resigned.

MISSOURI.

C. W. Culley to be postmaster at Bunceton, Mo., in place of Clarence M. Zeigle, resigned.

NEW JERSEY.

George N. Wimer to be postmaster at Palmyra, N. J., in place of Arthur Winner. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

NEW YORK.

George A. Duck to be postmaster at Great Neck Station, N. Y. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1911.

Arthur J. Wilson to be postmaster at Downsville, N. Y. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1911.

OREGON.

Jay P. Lucas to be postmaster at Hood River, Oreg., in place of William M. Yates, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

J. Frank Kneee to be postmaster at Batesburg, S. C., in place of J. Frank Kneee. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1910.

TENNESSEE.

Henry F. Ferguson to be postmaster at Centerville, Tenn., in place of James S. Beasley, resigned.

Robert P. Sulte to be postmaster at Rockwood, Tenn., in place of William F. Millican. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1911.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Richard A. Hall to be postmaster at Weston, W. Va., in place of Richard A. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1910.

WISCONSIN.

Frank H. Marshall to be postmaster at Kilbourn, Wis., in place of Frank H. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 1911.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF FISHERIES.

Hugh M. Smith to be deputy commissioner in the Bureau of Fisheries.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Francis H. Beach to be major.
First Lieut. Robert M. Nolan to be captain.
First Lieut. William O. Reed to be captain.
Second Lieut. Roy W. Holderness to be first lieutenant.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. George W. Cocheu to be captain.

INFANTRY ARM.

Maj. John F. Morrison to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Vernon A. Caldwell to be major.
Capt. Edmund L. Butts to be major.
Maj. William H. Sage to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Henry J. Hunt to be major.
Second Lieut. Richard R. Pickering to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Lowe A. McClure to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Charles F. Conry to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Clement H. Wright to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. William R. Scott to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. William W. Harris, jr., to be first lieutenant.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Henry P. Birmingham to be colonel.
Maj. Henry C. Fisher to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Cosam J. Bartlett to be major.

To be captains.

First Lieut. John R. Barber.
First Lieut. Joseph A. Worthington.
First Lieut. Mahlon Ashford.
First Lieut. Edward G. Huber.
First Lieut. John S. Lambie, jr.
First Lieut. Arthur N. Tasker.
First Lieut. Howard McC. Snyder.
First Lieut. Calvin D. Cowles, jr.
First Lieut. Garfield L. McKinney.
First Lieut. Hiram A. Phillips.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Thomas C. Goodman, paymaster, to be Deputy Paymaster General, with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Horace T. Aplington, Infantry, to be second lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Thomas Crooke McCleave.
Homer Clifton Moses.
George Louis Painter.
Louis Austin Bolling.
Arthur Alexander Finch.
William Henry Lloyd.
Chalmers Melancthon Van Poole.
Raymond Carl Andries.
Francis Theodore Buechli Fest.
Louis Alexander Greensfelder.
Neal Luther Hoskins.
James Wooffendale Inches.
Lawrence Lee.
Hiram Rittenhouse Loux.
Alexander Johnston MacKenzie.
William Jason Mixer.
Robert Albert Carl Wollenberg.
Richard Mills Pearce, jr.
Frederick Casimir Simon.
William Norwood Souter.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Edward Simpson to be a captain.
Medical Inspector James E. Gardner to be a medical director.
Machinist Frederick H. Richwien to be a chief machinist.
Lieut. Henry E. Lackey to be a lieutenant commander.
Lieut. Frederick J. Horne to be a lieutenant commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward S. Robinson to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Benjamin H. Steele to be a lieutenant.
Machinist John R. Likens to be a chief machinist.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Austin E. Stearns, Conway.

NORTH DAKOTA.

J. A. Meyer, New England.
C. E. Styer, Crosby.

OHIO.

Frank M. Kain, Batavia.
William J. Lockheart, Bellville.

UTAH.

William W. Wilson, Sandy.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Harry H. Bodley, Elm Grove.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 28, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (J. Res. 117, A) memorializing Congress, in enacting cold-storage legislation, not to limit the time during which said dairy products can be stored to less than one year.

Whereas Wisconsin is the leading dairy State in the Union, and its farmers are vitally interested in everything pertaining to that industry, having over \$5,000,000 invested in buildings and equipments, and \$55,000,000 in cows and other equipment necessary to carry on the dairy industry; and

Whereas if such legislation is enacted the farmers of Wisconsin, who have large amounts of money invested in the dairy business, will have their market destroyed, owing to the fact that a large proportion of their products is made in a few months of the year, and if said legislation is enacted the market for butter will be destroyed, with a consequent lessening of production resulting in a shortage and too high a price in winter; and

Whereas it has been proven that butter held in cold storage is not detrimental to the health of the consumer: Therefore be it